

KERNOS

Supplément 12

Gunnel EKROTH

*The Sacrificial Rituals
of Greek Hero-Cults*



Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique
Liège, 2002

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

KERNOS

Supplément 12

Gunnel EKROTH

*The Sacrificial Rituals
of Greek Hero-Cults*



Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique
Liège, 2002

The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Period

Gunnel Ekroth

Publisher : Presses universitaires de Liège

Year of publication : 2002

Published on OpenEdition Books : 15 May 2013

Serie : Kernos suppléments

Electronic ISBN : 9782821829008



<http://books.openedition.org>

Electronic reference:

EKROTH, Gunnel. *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Period*. New edition [online]. Liège: Presses universitaires de Liège, 2002 (generated 17 December 2013). Available on the Internet: <<http://books.openedition.org/pulg/490>>. ISBN: 9782821829008.

Printed version:

ISBN : 9782874560033

Number of pages : 429

© Presses universitaires de Liège, 2002

Terms of use:

<http://www.openedition.org/6540>

This study questions the traditional view of sacrifices in hero-cults during the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods. The analysis of the epigraphical and literary evidence for sacrifices to heroes in these periods shows, contrary to the traditional notion, that the main ritual in hero-cults was a *thysia* at which the worshippers consumed the meat from the animal victim. A particular handling of the animal's blood or a *holocaust*, rituals previously taken to be typical for heroes, can rarely be documented and must be considered as marginal features in hero-cults. The terms *eschara*, *escharon*, *bothros*, *enagizein*, *enagisma*, *enagismos* and *enagisterion*, believed to be characteristic for hero-cults, are seldom used in hero-contexts before the Roman period and occur mainly in the Byzantine lexicographers and in the *scholia*. Since the main kind of sacrifice in hero-cults was a *thysia*, a ritual intimately connected with the social structure of society, the heroes must have fulfilled the same role as the gods within the Greek religious system. The fact that the heroes were dead seems to have been of little significance for the sacrificial rituals and it is questionable whether the rituals of hero-cults are to be considered as originating in the cult of the dead.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements

Gunnel Ekroth

Abbreviations

Introduction

1. The problem and previous research
2. Method and evidence

Chapter I. Terms assumed to be related to hero-cult rituals

1. Eschara and escharon
2. Bothros
3. Enagizein, enagisma, enagismos and enagisterion

Chapter II. Evidence for sacrifices in hero-cults down to 300 BC

1. Epigraphical evidence
2. Literary evidence

Chapter III. The use and meaning of the rituals in a wider perspective

1. Destruction sacrifices
2. Blood rituals
3. Theoxenia
4. *Thysia* sacrifices followed by dining

Chapter IV. The ritual pattern

1. The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults
2. The Olympian-chthonian distinction
3. *Thysia* and powerful actions: low-intensity and high-intensity rituals
4. Immortality-mortality
5. The heterogeneity of heroes
6. Conclusion

Appendix. The sacrificial calendars of Attica

Bibliography

List of illustrations



Indexes

Inscriptions

Ancient authors

Greek terms

General index

Acknowledgements

Gunnel Ekroth

1

This study is a partly reworked Ph.D. thesis submitted in 1999 at the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Stockholm. I am happy to express my gratitude to all those who have been helpful and supportive over the years. Special thanks go to Berit Wells, who, besides the late Birgitta Bergquist, was my advisor, offering continuous support and constructive criticism. Robert Parker, acting as the opponent appointed by the department at the defence of the dissertation, provided many valuable insights and suggestions. I also want to thank Jesper Svenbro and Scott Scullion for pertinent observations and stimulating discussions on the topic.

2

A number of persons have answered questions, discussed various matters with me and also come with wise remarks, ideas and encouragement. I would like to thank Claude Björk, David Boehringer, Hedda von Ehrenheim, Renée Forsell, Dennis Hughes, Michael Jameson, Arto Penttinen, Hans Ruge, Ann-Louise Schallin, Charlotte Schetfer, Kerstin Silfwerbrand, Lena Sjögren, Ove Strid, Annie Verbanck-Piérard, as well as François de Polignac, who also gave me the possibility to present parts of my work at the Centre Louis Gernet in Paris. I am grateful to the editorial committee of Kernos for publishing my study in their supplement series and for the patient assistance offered by the editor, Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge. The conclusions and any errors remain, of course, my own.

3

Through the years I have received financial support from Knut and Alice Wallenbergs Stiftelse, Wallenbergsstiftelsens Jubileumsfond, Föreningen

Svenska Atheninstitutets Vänner, Rosa och Viktor Tengborgs Stiftelse and Stiftelsen Birgitta Bergquists Stipendiefond.

4

Finally, I want to thank my mother, my father and my husband Pelle who have encouraged and helped me continuously in every possible way. This work would never have been completed without their unfailing support.

5

Stockholm, December 2000

Abbreviations

The abbreviations of the ancient literary sources are those found in OCD³, apart from the following:

Ael. Arist. *Alex, epitaph.*

Ael. Arist. *Contr. Lept.*

Ael. Arist. *Hier. log. II*

Ael. Arist. *Smyrna*

Ap. Soph. *Lex. Hom.*

Ar. *Tag.*

Contr. *Macart.*

Dem. *Arist.*

Dem. *De falsa leg.*

Dem. *[In Neaer.]*

Dion. Byz. *Bosp.*

Erot. Voc. *Hipp.*

Etym. *Gud.*

15

Eur. *Cret.*

16

Eur. *Erech..*

17

Greg. Nys. *Encom. xl mart. II*

18

Herodian. *Div. Marc.*

19

Hippoc. *Corde.*

20

Hyp. *Epitaph.*

21

Isoc. *Hel.*

22

Isoc. *Plat.*

23

Lib. *Decl.*

24

Lib. *Progym.*

25

Lucian *Charon*

26

Lucian *De sacr.*

27

Lucian *De merc.*

28

Lucian *De sacr.*

29

Lucian *Menip.*

30

Lucian *Tim.*

31

Lys. *Epitaph.*

32

Opp. *Hal.*

33

Orph. *Argon.*

34

[Pl.] *Min.*

35

Plut. [*Cons. Ad Apoll.*]

36

Plut. *De malign. Her.*

37

Porph. *De phil.*

38

Ptol. *Ascal.*

39

Sor. *Vip. Hipp.*

40

Sopater *Diarr. zet.*

41

Synesios *Hymn.*

42

Aelius Aristides, Ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ ἐπιτάφιος

43

Aelius Aristides, Πρὸς Λεπτίνην ὑπὲρ ἀτελείας

44

Aelius Aristides, Ἱεροὶ λόγοι, β'

45

Aelius Aristides, Μονωδία ἐπὶ Εὐρύρην

46

Apollonios Sophista, *Lexicon Homericum*

47

Aristophanes, *Tagenistae*

48

Contra Macartatum

49

Demosthenes, *In Aristocratem*

50

Demosthenes, *De falsa legatione*

51

PS-Demosthenes, *In Neaeream*

52

Dionysios Byzantios, *Per Bosporum navigatio*

53

Erotianos, *Vocum Hippocraticarum collectio*

54

Etymologicum Gudianum

55

Euripides, Cretenses

56

Euripides, Erechtheus

57

Gregorios Nyssenos, Encomium in xl martyres II

58

Herodianos, Ab excessu divi Marci

59

Hippokrates, De corde

60

Hypereides, Epitaphius

61

Isokrates, Helenae encomium

62

Isokrates, Plataicus

63

Libanios, Declamationes

64

Libanios, Progymnasmata

65

Lucian, Charon sive contemplantes

66

Lucian, De astrologia

67

Lucian, De mercede conductis potentium familiaribus

68

Lucian, De sacrificiis

69

Lucian, Menippus sive necyomantia

70

Lucian, Timon

71

Lysias, Epitaphius

72

Oppianos, Hàlieutica

73

Orphie *Argonautica*

74

[Plato], *Minos*

75

Plutarch, *Consolatio ad Apollonium*

76

Plutarch, *De malignitate Herodoti*

77

Porphyrrios, *De philosophia ex oraculis*

78

Ptolemaios of Askalon

79

Soranos, *Vita Hippocratis*

80

Sopater, *Διάρσεις ζητημάτων*

81

Synesios, *Hymni*

1. The problem and previous research

1

The central act in the worship of the ancient Greek heroes was sacrifice. Many other actions were also performed—processions, dances, music, singing, prayers, athletic contests, horse-races, festivals and the déposition of votive offerings—but they were ail, to some extent, connected with sacrifice. The sacrifice was of major importance, since this particular ritual was aimed at mediating between the worshipper and the hero by the consécration of an offering, which was destroyed in one way or another.

1

This off ering could consist of an animal victim but could also be bloodless, such as cakes, bread, fruit and vegetables, or simply a libation.

2

The purpose of this study is twofold. First of ail, I shall try to establish what kinds of sacrificial rituals were practised in the worship of ancient Greek heroes in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods (c. 700 to 300 BC) on the basis of a combination of epigraphical and literary sources. It should be made clear from the outset that the main focus lies on the animal sacrifices performed to the heroes: bloodless offerings and libations will be discussed only in passing. The second purpose of my study concerns how thèse rituals may be explained and interpreted, and what they can tell us of the place and function of the cult of the heroes in Greek religion. The archaeological évidence for hero-cults will be considered only

occasionally, since I intend to treat that material later in a separate study that will complement the written sources.

3

The reason for investigating the sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults is related to the picture of these rituals presented in modern scholarly literature, which in its turn depends on which sources have been used and how. The major studies on Greek heroes, which also cover the sacrificial ritual, were written at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century and form part of the thorough, philological investigation of Greek religion, mainly by German scholars. The basis for the conclusions drawn then was mainly the literary sources, supplemented, to a lesser extent, by epigraphical evidence. Archaeological material was used sparingly, since, at that time, only little evidence of that kind was available.

4

Basically, heroes have been considered as receiving two kinds of sacrificial rituals, both of which have been regarded as being distinct from the sacrifices offered to gods, and in particular, the gods of the sky, and more closely connected with the cult of the dead and the gods of the underworld.

2

The rituals of hero-cults have been considered as ultimately deriving from the cult of the dead, as it was practised in the distant past and is therefore said to preserve older traits that later had been abandoned in the cult of the dead.

5

According to modern scholarship, the first kind of ritual used in hero-cults consisted of animal sacrifice, at which it was forbidden to eat the meat and at which the victim was totally destroyed, usually burnt in a holocaust.

3

The bloodletting was emphasized by bending the animal's head towards the ground when slitting its throat, while the blood was led into the hero's tomb by a tu

6

be or poured into a hole in the ground called a βόθρος.

4

The destruction of the victim, as well as the bloodletting, is considered to have been performed on a particular altar or hearth, an

ἔσχάρα, which was low and hollow.

5

The whole complex of rituals, which took place during the night, was mainly designated by the terms ἐναγίζειν, ἐνάγισμα or ἐναγισμός, terms never used for the sacrifices to the gods.

6

7

The other kind of ritual has been considered to have taken the form of a meal or a feast, δαίς or δεῖπνον, usually called θεοξένια in modern literature.

7

A table, τράπεζα, and a couch, κλίνη, were prepared for the hero, who was called upon to come and participate in the meal.

8

The food on the table was of the kind that could be eaten by humans, consisting mainly of bloodless offerings, such as cakes, bread, fruit and vegetables, but could also include cooked portions of the meat or the edible intestines, *splanchna*, of a sacrificed animal.

8

However, most previous work in this field has noted that there were also hero-cults which did not follow the scheme of rituals outlined above.

9

At these sacrifices, the hero received his share of the animal victim burnt on an altar, while the rest of the meat was eaten by the worshippers at a festive meal. The terminology used for these sacrifices was *thyein* and *thysia* for the rituals and *bomos* for the altar, i.e., the same terminology as for the sacrifices to the gods. The occurrence of sacrifices of this kind has been considered as being unusual in hero-cults and has often been explained as the result of later deviations from the sacrificial norm, as influences from the cult of the gods or as depending on terminological mistakes by the ancient sources.

10

It has also been suggested that *thysia* sacrifices, including dining, were used only when the hero had not died a proper death or when he was to be considered more of a god than a hero.

11

In 1944, Arthur Darby Nock showed that the number of cases of *thysia* sacrifices in hero-cults was far from insignificant and suggested that

the choice of ritual depended on the purpose and atmosphere when the sacrifice took place, as well as the disposition and aspect imputed to the recipients, rather than their identity or supposed habitat.

12

Later works, touching upon hero-cults or upon Greek sacrificial ritual, often state in passing that *thysia* sacrifices with dining were more common in hero-cults than was thought previously, but Sare still regarded as the major rituals used in hero-cults.

13

At présent, the standard view of hero-cult rituals is beginning to be increasingly questioned, but the traditional notions have recently also been defended.

14

9

Thus, it is clear that three kinds of rituals were used in hero-cults: (1) animal sacrifice at which the blood was poured out, the meat was destroyed and no meal was included in the ritual, (2) the presentation of a table with food offerings, such as cakes, vegetables, fruit and cooked meat, and (3) animal sacrifice at which the hero's portion was burnt on an altar, while the rest of the meat was eaten by the worshippers. There are two questions of main interest here. First of ail, to what extent was each of these rituals practised in hero-cults and which ritual, if any, can be said to have been the most prominent in hero-cults? Secondly, why did heroes receive different kinds of rituals? Is the choice of ritual to be explained by the heroes being connected with the dead and the gods of the underworld or can the ritual pattern be better understood by being linked to the situation in which the sacrifices were performed?

10

The problem with the earlier interpretation of the hero-cult rituals, i.e., as consisting mainly of destruction sacrifices, libations of blood and offerings of meals and more rarely of *thysia* sacrifices at which the worshippers ate, concerns both how the évidence has been treated and the theoretical approach to Greek sacrifices that has been chosen. First of ail, studies of hero-cults have almost exclusively been based on one category of material, the literary sources. The epigraphical and archaeological material has hardly been considered at ail in this context. Secondly, literary sources of different dates and characters have been mixed indiscriminately and information

derived from later sources has been used to fill in gaps in the knowledge of the practices in earlier periods. This is indeed tempting, especially since the Archaic and Classical sources are in many cases less explicit than the sources of the Roman period. Taken as a whole, the post-Classical sources often use a more clear-cut terminology and provide definitions of the rituals considered typical of hero-cults. Finally, the theoretical approach to the heroes and their cults has been dominated by the understanding of Greek religion as divided into an Olympian and a chthonian sphere, viewed as opposites. Accordingly, the heroes have been classified as chthonian and linked to the gods of the underworld and the dead. From this classification follows the assumption of certain sacrificial rituals.

2. Method and evidence

11

In order to establish the sacrificial rituals used in hero-cults, I have investigated the information which can be deduced from the epigraphical and literary evidence. These two kinds of sources have been treated separately, since each category of evidence poses its own problems. By first separating the inscriptions from the literary texts and then comparing them, it is to be hoped that a fuller picture of the sacrifices in hero-cults can be obtained.

12

My point of departure has been the rituals themselves: what was done and what terminology was used for these actions? The importance of concrete rituals in ancient religion has often been undervalued, since we subconsciously tend to judge the contents of a religion from the Christian point of view: a religion in which the internal experience is regarded as more significant than the actual rituals performed and in which the ritual killing of animals has no place.

15

13

Chapter I consists of a deeper study of some terms usually considered as being characteristic of hero-cults. The existence of a particular terminology to describe sacrifices to heroes has commonly been assumed, but it has also been noted that the use of the terms is not consistent. I have chosen to concentrate on the terms *ἐσχάρια* and

ἔσχαρῶν, βόθρος and ἐναγίζειν and the related nouns ἐνάγισμα, ἐναγισμός and ἐναγιστήριον. To understand the full extent of the relation between these terms and hero-cults, it is necessary to look into all contexts in which these terms occur, no matter what the recipient and the date. This is especially important, since the notion of a particular terminology and ritual for hero-cults is mainly based upon sources later than 300 BC. An extended investigation of these terms makes it possible to distinguish whether the meaning and use of these terms have changed and to what extent the later evidence can be used to throw light on the conditions of earlier periods.

14

Chapter II deals exclusively with sources no later than 300 BC, in order to try to distinguish the sacrificial rituals of hero-cults strictly from the contemporaneous evidence. The chronological span of interest here is the Archaic to early Hellenistic periods (c. 700-300 BC). Though the period covered is 400 years, the bulk of the material dates to the 5th and the 4th centuries. The starting-point around 700 has been chosen, since it is at the beginning of the 7th century that the earliest traces of hero-cults have been documented definitely.

16

The lower time limit of c. 300 BC has been set, since a new phase can be distinguished in Greek religion from that time on, even though tendencies towards this development can be found in previous periods as well, and there has been a trend in recent scholarship to underline the continuation of religious practices from the Classical into the Hellenistic periods.

17

In any case, the concept of the hero underwent major changes in the Hellenistic period and the term heros was more widely used, since individuals were heroized more frequently and for less clear reasons than previously.

18

15

Since some of the terms considered as particular to hero-cults are only, or predominantly, documented in connection with heroes in the post-Classical sources, a chronological restriction to 700-300 BC seems particularly useful. This approach is different from the one usually adopted in studies of Greek religion, in which sources of various dates and characters have been mixed more or less

indiscriminately, and it should be viewed as an experiment to find out, which conclusions concerning the ritual practices can be reached, on the basis of the Archaic to early Hellenistic material alone.

19

16

The written evidence investigated in chapters I and II includes only such inscriptions and texts as provide information on how the sacrifices were performed. Simple mentions of cult places and statues or graves of heroes have been excluded, as well as allusions to or hints of hero-cults, which offer no direct description of the ritual.

20

The epigraphical material consists of sacrificial calendars, sacred laws and various kinds of decrees and generally has a more factual content than the literary sources. The large body of dedicatory inscriptions to heroes has not been considered, since they give no direct information on the ritual practices.

21

Most of the literary texts reviewed here are prose texts, such as those by historians, orators and philosophers. However, poetry, tragedy and comedy also contain references to sacrifices made to heroes. It is not possible to establish any criteria as to which kinds of texts should be regarded as the more reliable, but it is commonly accepted that the information yielded by tragedies and comedies needs to be treated with a great deal more care than that derived from the historians.

22

What needs to be done in each case is to establish whether the sacrifice described is of a kind that could have taken place in actually practised religion or whether it is supposed to be a mythic or epic ritual meant to differ from the daily reality of the Greeks.

17

The geographical area that I have chiefly concentrated on covers the Greek mainland and the islands of the central Aegean, since most of the cults documented in the sources are to be found in these regions. However, hero-cults are a phenomenon that occurs in all territories where the Greeks were present, and examples from outside my main area will be considered from time to time, since it is impossible, as well as unwise, to set too strict limits.

Chapter III is focused in greater detail on each of the four ritual categories—destruction sacrifices, blood rituals, *theoxenia* and *thysia* sacrifices followed by dining—the uses of which were established in chapters I and II, in order to better define the place and function of each kind of ritual in hero-cults. To do so, the sacrificial rituals have to be put into a wider context, by relating them to the occurrence of similar rituals both in the cult of the gods and in the cult of the dead. Of main concern here is the question to what extent the ritual variations are to be connected with the character of the recipient or with the situation in which the sacrifice was performed.

Chapter IV, finally, deals with the ritual pattern of hero-cults, locating the heroes in the Greek religious System from a ritual point of view in relation to the gods and the dead.

This study concerns heroes in ancient Greece, but the concept of the hero is not as clear-cut as it may seem at first. A hallmark of Greek religion is the multitude of recipients of religious attention: not only the pan-Hellenic gods but a variety of lesser gods, some of which were of foreign origin, while others were local divinities sometimes connected with physical features such as rivers or springs. To these can be added heroes, nymphs, Charités and a number of other divine beings.

The ancient Greeks themselves do not seem to have had any clear-cut rules as to what distinguished one group from another, nor does there seem to have existed any need for strict divisions. Nevertheless, heroes were distinguished both from the gods and from the dead, and a modern study dealing with heroes must make clear what is understood by the term "hero" in its own context. In this study, I have applied the following definition.

First of all, a hero is a person who has *lived and died*, either in myth or real life, or as Rudhardt puts it, *le héros naît, il vit, il meurt*.

This is the main distinction between a god and a hero. He is thus dead and may have a tomb at one or several locations. The tomb is

sometimes the focus of a cult, but it is not necessary to have the hero's tomb to start a cult.

22

The difference between a hero and an ordinary dead person depends on the relationship between the recipient and those who are concerned with the cult. A hero is a dead person who is released from the family. The ordinary dead have some kind of connection with those presenting the offerings and tending the tomb, either as a known member of the family or as an ancestor (even though an ancestor seems in many respects to have been more like a hero). The cult of the ordinary dead is a private matter, of concern only to the family. A hero, on the other hand, even though he is a historical person, is not connected with the family but belongs to the public sphere. Families and private persons worship heroes, but they are mainly of concern to the community or groups of the community and are *worshipped on a more official level than the ordinary dead*.

26

23

Furthermore, I consider the hero to be a local phenomenon. Many heroes are known to have been worshipped at only one location, but several heroes received cult at a couple of sites. The important fact for my purpose here is that the cult is not spread over the entire Greek territory, like that of the gods. Herakles, the Dioskouroi and Asklepios are examples of heroes whose cult became so widespread that they must be considered as belonging to a different category. The ancient view of these deities seems to have been that, even though they were once mortal men who died, they had officially been transformed into gods.

27

24

Finally, the denomination. It is clear from the ancient evidence that often no sharp line was drawn between the divinities called *heroes* and those called *theoi* and a hero could sometimes be called a god (*theos*) or become a god permanently.

28

It has been suggested that some heroes started out as gods originally, but that process is less clearly defined in the ancient sources.

29

25

Some characters classified as heroes according to my definition are called *theos*, as well as *theos* and *heros*, in the epigraphical and literary sources. These heroes are still included here, if the worship is not pan-Hellenic and they are considered as dead.

30

26

To sum up, my definition of a hero is that he is dead and receives worship locally on a more official level than the ordinary dead. A hero can be called *theos* occasionally but still be a hero. From this definition, it follows that the heroes, as I see them, are a mixed lot, which includes mythological and epic characters, famous historical persons, the more anonymous war dead and characters known only from cult contexts. The sacrificial ritual, and the terminology used to describe it, do not have any direct bearing on whether a recipient of cult should be classified as a hero or not.

Notes

1 For the definition of sacrifice, see Hubert & Mauss 1964, 10-13; Vernant 1991, 290-291; cf. Leach 1976, 83-84.

2 Deneken 1886-90, 2486-2487; Rohde 1925, 116; Pfister 1909-12, 466; Stengel 1920, 141; Farnell 1921, 95 and 370; Meuli 1946, 192-197 and 209; Nilsson 1967, 186-187; Rudhardt 1958, 251-253; Burkert 1985, 205. This view of the sacrifices to heroes is present from the beginning of the study of Greek religion in the middle of the 19th century, for example, in the studies by Creuzer 1842, 763-769; Hermann 1846, 66-67; Schoemann 1859, 173, 212-213 and 218-219; Wassner 1883, 5-25. The 19th century scholarship will be further discussed below, pp. 296-298.

3 Deneken 1886-90, 2506; Pfister 1909-12, 477; Foucart 1918, 41; Rohde 1925, 116 with n. 14; Stengel 1920, 16 and 142; Farnell 1921, 95; Meuli 1946, 193 and 209; Rudhardt 1958, 238-239; Brelich 1958, 9.

4 Deneken 1886-90, 2504-2505; Pfister 1909-12, 474-475; Stengel 1910, 151; Foucart 1918, 99; Stengel 1920, 16-17; Farnell 1921, 95; Rohde 1925, 116; Meuli 1946, 194; Rudhardt 1958, 129; Brelich 1958, 9; Nilsson 1967, 78 and 186; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 199.

5 Deneken 1886-90, 2497-2498; Pfister 1909-12, 475-476; Foucart 1918, 97; Stengel 1920, 15-16 and 141; Farnell 1921, 95-96; Rohde 1925, 116 with n. 10; Rudhardt 1958,

129 and 250-251; Brelich 1958, 9; Nilsson 1967, 78; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 199.

6 Deneken 1886-90, 2505-2506; Pfister 1909-12, 466-474; Foucart 1918, 98; Stengel 1920, 143; Farnell 1921, 95; Rohde 1925, 116 with n. 15; Méautis 1940, 16; Rudhardt 1958, 238; Brelich 1958, 9; Nilsson 1967, 186; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 194 and 205.

7 Deneken 1886-90, 2507-2509; Foucart 1918, 101; Nilsson 1967, 187; Meuli 1946, 194-195; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 205.

8 Rohde 1925, 116; Nilsson 1967, 187.

9 Deneken 1886-90, 2506; Foucart 1918, 94-100; Pfister 1909-12, 478-489; Stengel 1920, 141-142; Méautis 1940, 16; Meuli 1946, 195-197; Rudhardt 1958, 264; Brelich 1958, 16-19; Nilsson 1967, 186.

10 Foucart 1918, 101-106; Pfister 1909-12, 478-479; Rohde 1925, 140, n. 15; Meuli 1946, 197; Nilsson 1967, 186-187.

11 Stengel 1920, 141-142; Pfister 1909-12, 480-489.

12 Nock 1944, reprinted in *Essays on religion*, 575-602. Some of the *évidence* was collected and already discussed by Ada Thomsen in 1909 (Thomsen 1909).

13 For example, Habicht 1970, 203-204; van Straten 1974, 174; Slater 1989, 487-490; Kearns 1989, 3-4; Kearns 1992, 67-68; Seaford 1994, 114; Scullion 1994, 115; Bruit Zaidman & Schmitt Pantel 1992, 37 and 179; van Straten 1995, 157-159. Sacrifices to heroes have, in general, received little attention in the recent work dealing with Greek sacrifices. There is, for example, no study dealing with hero-cults in any of the three comprehensive collections on Greek ritual, *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec* (1979, translated into English as *The cuisine of sacrifice among the Greeks*, 1989), *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité* (1981) and *Sacrificio e società nel mondo antico* (Grottanelli & Parise 1988).

14 Annie Verbanck-Piérard has challenged the existence of the heroic cults of Herakles and Asklepios (1989, 1992, 2000), as well as demonstrated the closeness of gods and heroes in the Attic deme calendars (1998). For critique of other aspects of the common notions concerning hero-cults, see also Ekroth 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001. At a seminar on the Olympian-chthonian distinction, in Gothenburg in April 1997, Robert Parker (forthcoming) proposed a modification of what constitutes heroic rituals, though still arguing for a distinction between the sacrificial practices of heroes and of gods.

The validity of the Olympian-chthonian division and its applicability to hero-cults has been defended by Scullion (1994, 1998, 2000). See also Riethmüller (1996, 1999), maintaining the importance of holocausts, blood libations and *bothroi* in the cult of Asklepios.

15 See, for example, Gould 1994, 94-106, on the awareness of Herodotos concerning the details of sacrificial rituals and the difficulties for anyone brought up in the Christian (and especially in the Protestant) tradition to grasp the importance of ritual; Durand 1989a, 87-88, who has studied the killing and butchering of animals

in Tunisia in order better to understand ancient animal sacrifice; on the importance of the practical details of sacrifices, see Vernant 1991, 280-281; cf. Détienné 1989a, 18. On the Christian, especially Protestant, concept of religion affecting the study of ancient rituals, see Graf 1995, esp. 114; Parker 1996, 79; Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 302.

16 The beginning of the oikist cults, which may have been a source of inspiration for the hero-cults in the Greek motherland, can be dated to c. 750-680 (see Malkin 1987, 261). In Greece, the earliest inscribed dedication at the Menelaion (to Helen) is dated to the 7th century (Catling & Cavanagh 1976, 147-152, c. 675-650; Jefferey 1990, 446 and 448, no. 3a, c. 600 for the inscription), but the activity at the site began already during the 8th century, see Catling 1976-77, 35-36. The tripod dedications in the Polis cave on Ithaka, which begin in the middle of the 9th century, may be another case of an early hero-cult (see Malkin 1998, 94-199, for discussion and references). Some of the Iron Age activity at Bronze Age tombs stretches back to the 9th and even the 10th century, but since there are no written sources to help to clarify these remains, it is not clear whether they should be considered as being traces of hero-cults or of tomb-cults (or of an activity of some other kind), see Antonaccio 1995 a, *passim*; Antonaccio 1993, 46-70.

17 See, for example, Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 199-216, on chairs not being used on funerary epitaphs before the 4th century BC, since it implied a degree of heroization, deification or immortality, a concept which gradually spread to the regular dead in the Hellenistic period. For deifications before Alexander, see Fredricksmeier 1981, 145-156; Sanders 1991, 275-287; Habicht 1970, 3-16. On private cult foundations, see Wittenburg 1990; Laum 1914. On euergetism: Gauthier 1985. On ruler cults: Cerfaux & Tondraux 1957; Taeger 1957; Habicht 1970; Price 1984a. On the continuation of the polis religion into Hellenistic times, see Graf 1995; Mikalson 1998, *passim*, esp. 315-323; cf. Parker 1996, 280.

18 See, for example Price 1984a, 35; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 205-206; Parker 1996, 276; Herrmann P. 1995, 195-197. On the term *héros* on gravestones, see Craik 1980, 175-176; Lattimore 1962, 97-99. Not all these new heroes may have received some form of cult, see Fraser 1977, 76-81; Foucart 1918, 145-151; for evidence of cult, see Graf 1985, 127-135.

19 Cf. Kirk (1981, 62), who cautions against the mixing of Homeric and post-Homeric material, and Rudhardt (1958, 5-8) who advocates an "internal method", meaning that ancient Greek religion is to be understood and explained according to its own concepts and beliefs, i.e., on the basis of material from a limited period of time. At a later stage, in a separate study, this investigation of the written evidence will be combined with archaeological material from the same periods.

20 Tragedy often alludes to hero-cult, see Mikalson 1991, 29-45; cf. Harrison S. 1989, 173-175, on the particular case of Sophokles and a hero-cult of Philoktetes.

21 Many more heroes than those considered here are known from the written sources, but we have no knowledge of their cults; see, for example, Kearns (1989,

Appendix 1, 139-207), who lists 298 heroes of Attica, for whom a cult can be attested in only 168 cases.

22 For a discussion on the problème relating to the character of the sources, see Kirk 1981, 61-62; Parker 1983, 15-16; Mikalson 1991, *passim*; van Straten 1995, 5-9; Johnston 1999, xii and 7.

23 Of interest here are the divinities actually receiving a cult. The theoretical view of Greek religion, as represented in the philosophical writings, offers other categories, for example *daimones* (see further, p. 193, n. 278) which, although not being worshipped, can be taken as another sign of the variability of the Greek concept of the divine.

24 In the folio wing pages, when I speak of the hero as “he”, it is a simplification meant to cover both male heroes and female heroines.

25 Rudhardt 1958, 128. Some heroes, for example, Amphiaraios, did not die an ordinary death but simply disappeared and they have thus been classified by modern scholars as not being true heroes (Vicaire 1979, 2-45); on the disappearance of heroes in general, see Lacroix 1988, 183-198; Pfister 1909-12, 480-489. However, in my view, the way in which a person ended his life does not affect whether he should be classified as a hero or not.

26 A further distinction between a deceased person and a hero is that the latter was known to appear on earth and to interfere with the living, mainly in a beneficent manner (see Hdt. 6.117; Hdt. 8.37-39; Paus. 1.15.3). On the ghosts of the dead interfering with the living, see Johnston 1999, 36-81.

27 That Herakles was more of a god than a hero seems to be the opinion of many ancient sources (Xen. An. 6.2.15; Isoc. *Philip* 33). The latest modern work on the nature of Herakles considers him more as a god than as a hero (see Verbanck-Piérard 1989, 43-64; Verbanck-Piérard 1992, 85-106; Woodford 1971, 212-213). Dioskouroi: Farnell 1921, 193-228; Burkert 1985, 212-213; Hermay 1986, 591. Asklepios: Edelstein & Edelstein 1945, 1-138; Aleshire 1989, 26 with n. 7; Burkert 1985, 214-215; Verbanck-Piérard 2000, 301-332.

28 The athlete Theogenes from Thasos is often called *theos* in the sources (most of which are of Roman date); see, for example, Paus. 6.11.2-9; Bernard & Salviat 1962, 594, no. 15; Bernard & Salviat 1967, 579, no. 26; cf. Pouilloux 1994. The *Heros Iatros* from Athens is designated as *theos* in IG II² 839 (221/0 BC): heros in this case seems to have functioned more as a name or a title. Cf. the cases of the *theos* Hypodektes (IG II² 2501) and the *heros* Egretes (G II² 2499) discussed below, pp. 148-149.

29 Usener 1896, 252-273; Burkert 1985, 205-206.

30 Furthermore, the use of the term *heros* itself is not always helpful, since its meaning varied greatly between different contexts and periods. In Homer and Hesiod, *heros* is used for a warrior, prince or nobleman, but never for a recipient of cult (see West 1978, 190 and 370-373; for a different opinion, see van Wees 1992, 6-8; cf. Hadzisteliou-Price 1973, 129-144; Hadzisteliou-Price 1979, 219-228; Antonaccio 1994, 389-410). In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, *heros* used on gravestones

seems to have been an equivalent to "the departed" or "the deceased" (see above, p. 18, n. 18).

Chapter I. Terms assumed to be related to hero-cult rituals

1

In the modern literature on hero-cults, a number of terms have been classified as being particularly applicable to the sacrifices to heroes. This terminology is said to express the specific characteristics of the rituals used in hero-cults and to distinguish them from the sacrifices to the gods, while at the same time linking the heroes to the cult of the ordinary dead.

2

Among the terms chosen for a closer study in this chapter are ἐσχάρα, ἐσχάρων and βόθρος, which refer to the altars or sacrificial installations that were supposedly used in hero-cults. Furthermore, the verb ἐναγίζειν and its three connected nouns, ἐνάγισμα, ἐναγισμός and ἐναγιστήριον, will be investigated: these terms all refer to the sacrificial rituals. The use and meaning of *eschara*, *escharon* and *bothros* have not been extensively covered previously.

1

Enagizein, *enagisma*, *enagismos* and *enagisterion* have been studied by Casabona, Rudhardt and Pfister, but the specific connection between these terms and hero-cults merits further study.

2

3

Other terms have also been considered as being particularly applicable to hero-cults, for example, *entemnein*, *sphagiazein*, *holokautein* and *choai*. These terms will be partly commented upon in Chapters II and III and have also been the focus of thorough investigations previously.

3

From this work, it is clear that the connection between these terms

and hero-cults is not as prominent as for the terms mentioned above and that they were also used to cover the sacrificial activity in other kinds of cults than hero-cults, either of the gods or of the departed.

4 To understand the use and meaning of a term, all the contexts in which it appears should be investigated. This is the lexical approach formulated by Benveniste, which has been employed by Casabona and Rudhardt in their work on Greek religious terminology and the same method has also been applied by Peirce in her study of iconographical representations of sacrifices.

4

5 Casabona argues that any study of the terminology should include as many contexts as possible: *si l'on veut conserver le contact avec les réalités, on se gardera de toute construction qui ne reposerait pas sur une étude philologique aussi exhaustive que possible.*

5

Casabona emphasizes that the terms are inseparable from the notions they convey and that their use and meaning develop with them. It cannot be taken for granted that the use and meaning of a certain term in the Classical period was the same as, for example, during the 2nd century AD.

6 To be able to test the assumption that the terms *eschara*, *escharon*, *bothros*, *enagizein*, *enagisma*, *enagismos* and *enagisterion* were particularly connected with hero-cults, it is therefore necessary to look into all contexts in which these terms are found, independently of their date and character. This means including also sources which are substantially later than 300 BC, since the connection between heroes and these terms is particularly apparent in the post-Classical sources.

6

The investigation of the whole chronological span of the use of these terms is especially important, in order to define the validity of the information derived from later sources for conditions also in earlier periods and to distinguish whether the use and meaning of the terms had undergone any changes.

7 The terms investigated in this chapter are used in sources spanning

more than 1500 years. The inscriptions of interest here date from the 4th century BC to the 4th century AD. On the whole, the epigraphical material is not abundant, particularly from the Archaic and Classical periods. It is also of relatively uniform character and there is therefore no need for a division into more specific groups.

8

The literary material, on the other hand, is more extensive. The texts date from the 6th century BC and well into the Byzantine period and to be able to handle such a considerable period, the sources have been arranged in three categories depending on their date and character. The first category consists of sources from the *Archaic to early Hellenistic periods*, i.e., from approximately 700 down to 300 BC. The second and third categories are formed by literary sources dated after 300 BC, but they have been separated, depending on their character and aim. The second category comprises *post-300 BC sources, which use the investigated terms as something wellunderstood and still relevant in contemporary society*. They date from the 3rd century BC to approximately the 5th century AD. The third category partly overlaps chronologically with the second and consists of *explicatorysources, which aim at explaining a term or concept, such as the lexica,the scholia and the commentators on earlier texts*. The work of the ancient lexicographers and commentators is mainly later than the 5th century AD and some of the sources are as late as the 13th century AD.

7

The scholia are notoriously difficult to date, even for experts; although some of their contents may go back to the Classical period, they are mainly preserved in the Byzantine editions, after having passed through the Roman abbreviations of the Hellenistic *hypomnemata*.

8

1. Eschara and escharon

9

The word *eschara* has a variety of meanings. The *LSJ* gives the following explanations:

9

(i) hearth, fireplace, pan of coals, brazier, watch-fires, (ii) sacrificial hearth (hollowed out of the ground and so distinguished from *bomos*, structural altar; used especially in hero-worship), frequently used generally, altar of burnt-offering, (iii) fire-stick, (iv) platform, stand, basis; grating, (v) scab, eschar, on a wound caused by burning or otherwise, (vi) in the plural, parts of the female sexual organs.

10

In the *LSJ* supplement of 1996, the religious connotations of the term have been played down. The explanations given here are, on the one hand, a place for the fire, from which was derived the meanings “hollow scab”, “hollowed-out wood” and “external female genitals”, and, on the other, a container for fire, brazier and fire-basket (not clearly distinguished from the sense “altar”), from which was derived the meanings “grid” and “lattice-work”.

11

Escharon is explained as “a place for a hearth” (*LSJ* s.v.).

10

Although the explanations presented above may seem highly diverse, two common features can be distinguished.

12

In the first place, fire is closely related to an *eschara*, whether it is a religious installation where sacrifices are burnt,

13

a part of the equipment made out of wood for making a fire,

14

a scab on a wound which has been cauterized to facilitate healing

15

or simply a burn injury.

16

Secondly, in most meanings of the term, there can be found an indication of an *eschara* being hollow or surrounding something. The hearth and brazier are by their nature hollow, an altar may have a sunken area on top, the wooden board used for making the fire has a hole in it,

17

and as a medical term *eschara* can signify a hollow wound on the body.

18

11

The use of *eschara* in a religious context is not too frequent and the

term is, in fact, mainly found in the medical literature.

19

In the modern scholarly literature, the term has been particularly connected with the heroes, the dead and the chthonian divinities.

20

In these contexts, the term is explained as an altar used in their cult and it is frequently contrasted with *bomos*, the altar for Olympian sacrifices. An *eschara* is thought to have had a particular appearance, being low, shaped like a mound and/or hollow, in contrast to a *bomos*, which has been considered as being high and well-built.

21

The use of the term *eschara* for the altar has also been taken as a sign that specific rituals took place in hero-cults, as well as in chthonian cults in general, for example, the pouring of the blood of the animal slaughtered into a hole in the ground and the burning of the entire sacrificial victim.

22

At the same time, it has been noted that the distinctions between *eschara* and *bomos*, both concerning the appearance and the rituals for which they were used, were not always accurately observed.

23

The term *eschara* could be used for *bomos* and in particular for the upper, sunken part of a *bomos*.

24

The variations in the meaning of the term *eschara* (a particular kind of altar used for the heroes and the chthonians, as well as an equivalent of *bomos* or simply a hearth used for sacrifices) have led some scholars to question the distinctions between *eschara* and *bomos* and even to suggest that *eschara* should be avoided altogether, owing to its lack of clarity.

25

12

Eschara is commented upon in most studies touching upon Greek religion. The term is usually discussed in connection with heroes and chthonian cults in general and considered as adequately understood and documented. In general, it can be said that there is at present a consensus on a distinction between *eschara* and *bomos* as two different kinds of altars, each with a particular appearance and each used for different kinds of divinities and rituals, although there is an awareness of the evidence arguing against such a division.

1.1. Epigraphical sources

1.1.1. Eschara

13

The term *eschara* is commonly found in the inscriptions, but it is not immediately obvious what kind of object is meant.

27

Is it the altar on which the sacrifice was performed or the brazier or grill on which some or all the meat was prepared afterwards? Only a small number of the *escharai* mentioned in the inscriptions can be interpreted as being altars, but the interpretation is complicated by the fact that a hearth, too, could be used for sacrifices.

28

14

The majority of the *escharai* mentioned in the inscriptions are found in the temple inventories from Athens and Delos dating from around the mid-4th to the end of the 2nd century BC. Frequently, the *escharai* are listed with other kinds of metal objects and specified as being of bronze, iron or even silver.

29

A silver *eschara* was probably not used as a simple hearth but may rather have been an incense-burner.

30

It is possible that all the bronze and iron *escharai* were portable hearths.

31

In some instances, the context seems to be connected especially with dining, since in the same section of the inscription are mentioned cooking-pots, meat-hooks, spits, vessels for preparing sausages, trays, buckets, kraters, jugs, wine-ladles, strainers, drinking-vessels, couches, lamps, stands, etc.

32

A few of these *escharai* are specified as μεγάλη and αὐτόστροφος, the latter, according to the *LSJ*, meaning something which rotates.

33

These *escharai* are best interpreted as grills equipped with an arrangement for placing and rotating the spits and thus facilitating the grilling of the meat, like a modern Greek *gyros* or a *shwarma* of the

Middle East. None of the *escharai* listed in these temple inventories can be interpreted as having functioned solely as altars.

15

The *escharai* found in the temple inventories, which form the bulk of the occurrences of the term in the epigraphical evidence, seem to have been used as hearths or grills and were in most cases movable. Some of these may have been employed for sacrifices, but it seems most likely that they were used for the preparation of food. Before moving on to the *escharai* with a stronger sacrificial connection, it should be mentioned that a completely different meaning of the term is also found in the inscriptions. *Eschara* could mean simply a grating, with no connection with fire. This seems to be the meaning of the term in an inscription from Epidauros dating to c. 370 BC.

34

These *escharai* appear to have been connected with the subterranean waterworks and were located in the drains of the water-tanks for cleaning purposes. Another non-religious use of *eschara* is found in an early 3rd-century inscription recording the monthly pay-outs by the temple of Apollon on Delos.

35

Here it is mentioned that a certain Theodemos is paid one drachma and three obols for having made an *eschara* of wood, an amount equivalent to one day's work. A hearth or altar of wood seems unlikely, since the fire would have consumed the *eschara*.

36

Tréheux suggested that the wood referred to was a base or the feet of an *eschara* of terracotta or of metal, while Hellmann interpreted the *eschara* as not connected with fire at all, but as some kind of chariot used for the transportation of stone.

37

16

Few *escharai* mentioned in the inscriptions can be interpreted as being altars and even fewer show any connection with hero-cults. The first and clearest case of an *eschara* being connected with hero-cults, as well as referring to an altar or a sacrificial installation, is an inscription from Porto Raphti, Attica (Fig. 1). It consists of a stone- ς sqára slab inscribed Ηρακλειδῶν ἐσχάρα and is dated to the 4th century BC.

38

The topmost part with the inscription is smooth, while the lower two-thirds are rough. The stone itself is too small to be an altar, but the treatment, as well as the dimensions, confirm that it is a *horos*. Nothing is known of the find circumstances. The stone may have delimited a sacred area where the *eschara* was located.

39

Perhaps the *eschara* consisted only of a heap of ashes on the ground and had to be marked by the stone, owing to its inconspicuous appearance.

40

Nothing further is known of the cult of the Herakleidai at this particular location, but they received what seem to have been regular *thysia* sacrifices, followed by dining, in both the Thorikos and the Erchia calendars, and they are also known from other locations in Attica.

41




Fig. 1. *Horos* from Porto Raphti, Attica, bearing the inscription Ἡρακλειδῶν ἐσχάρα, 4th century BC, *IG* II2 4977. Drawing after Rhousopoulos 1862, 83, no. 84.

An *eschara*, as well as a *bomos*, are mentioned in an inscription from Kos recording the testamentary foundation by a certain Diomedon,

dated from the late 4th to the early 3rd century BC.

42

The object of worship was Herakles, with the additional name Diomedonteios. In lines 120–130, there is a small inventory of the sanctuary, in which the founder Diomedon informs us that “he dedicated two lamp-stands, two lamps of bronze with seven flames, a square *eschara*, a krater, a rug, a table, five gilt wreaths for the statues, two clubs, three gilt incense-burners and one couch, so that all the holy things will belong to Herakles, as well as a base for the couch and a trencher (*kyklon*) of bronze”.

43

Farnell suggested that this cult had two kinds of altars, a *bomos* and an *eschara*, which would reflect the duality of the cult of Herakles as being both a god and a hero.

44

This seems unlikely, since the *eschara* is mentioned among the inventories and the *bomos* only in the section in which the regulations of the sacrifices to Herakles, Hebe, Hera, Dionysos, Aphrodite and the Moirai are specified (lines 25–36). The objects listed with the *eschara* could have been used by the worshippers when banqueting. However, Herakles receiving food and drink also formed a part of both his cult and his iconography.

45

Since the inventories are specifically dedicated to Herakles, the *eschara* is more likely to have been a grill or an incense-burner, which was part of the *theoxenia* equipment for Herakles, than an altar.

46

18

The remaining cases of *eschara* are not connected with heroes, but with gods. The first case concerns a group of inscriptions from Lindos, Rhodes, dated from the late 5th to the 3rd century BC.

47

They were found cut into the rock, downhill from the acropolis towards the main port. Some of the inscriptions are located near a small *naiskos* or temple, 9.20 × 5.35 m, dated to around 700 BC on the basis of pottery evidence.

48

Of a total of 40 inscriptions, 21 contain the expression προσχάριτος θυσία.

49

Blinkenberg took *proscharaios* to be a Dorian contraction of *prò tâv Çsqárav* and interpreted the meaning as a *thysia* taking place in front of the *eschara*, which he understood as a simple altar constructed for the particular occasion.

50

Some of the instances of *proscharaios thysia* are labelled *boukopia* or *theodaisia*: Blinkenberg suggested that the terms referred to sacrifices of cattle or of meals and named the area of the inscriptions the Boukopion.

51

Blinkenberg further argued that the divinity worshipped was Athena, who received burnt animal sacrifices at the Boukopion and, in accordance with the literary tradition, unburnt, bloodless offerings on the acropolis.

52

19

According to Blinkenberg's interpretation, the Lindian inscriptions could be taken as evidence for the use of *eschara* meaning an altar in the epigraphical record. However, there are complications. The rock near some of the inscriptions was flat and suitable for the slaughter of animals, but in other cases there was no suitable area nearby for that kind of activity.

53

Furthermore, the specification that a sacrifice is to take place in front of the altar is both puzzling and unusual.

54

20

Recently a new inscription was discovered in the same area.

55

The publisher Kostomitsopoulos agreed with Blinkenberg that *proscharaios thysia* could be interpreted as a sacrifice taking place before the *eschara* and that *eschara* in this context would mean an altar on which offerings were burnt. The meaning of the expression *proscharaios thysia* would then be a sacrifice performed in front of the altar for burnt-offerings, i.e., a non-burnt sacrifice, and be an example of the Rhodian tradition of *apyra hiera*, the unburnt, vegetal offerings mentioned by the literary sources (see n. 52). Kostomitsopoulos found this explanation unsatisfactory for several reasons, not least the ritual implications, and suggested instead that

proscharaios may have no connection at all with *eschara*. *Proscharaios* could be temporal instead of modal and refer to the circumstance that the ritual was performed on the *Proschaireteria* or *Procharisteria*, a day at the end of the winter when the crops were beginning to grow and sacrifices were performed to Athena and Kore.

56

However, the *Proschaireteria* or *Procharisteria* seems to be known only from Athens and the sources mentioning this festival indicate a particular connection with the religious situation in Attica.

57

If Kostomitsopoulos' explanation of the *proscharaios* inscriptions is to be followed, we have to assume that this Ionian festival was also performed on Dorian Rhodes. Therefore, in spite of the ritual oddity of a sacrifice before an altar, *proscharaios* is perhaps to be interpreted as referring to some kind of *eschara* in the sense of altar, rather than to a festival.

21

An *eschara* of Dionysos is mentioned in four Attic ephebic inscriptions, ranging from 127/6 to 107/6 BC.

58

The context in which the *eschara* occurs differs slightly between the four inscriptions. According to IG II² 1006, the ephebes brought Dionysos from the *eschara* to the theatre by torchlight, εἰσήγαγον δὲ [κ]αὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσχάρας εἰς τὸ θέατρον μετὰ φωτός,, sent a bull to the Dionysia festival and sacrificed it at the shrine at the time of the procession, ἔθυσαν ἐν [τ]ῷ ἱερῷ τῇ πομπῇ. The inscription from 107/6 BC (IG II² 1011, 11–12) states that the ephebes sacrificed (*thysantes*) to the god before conducting him from the *eschara* and that they also consecrated a phiale worth 100 drs.

22

This *eschara* seems to have been a well-known feature in the cult of Dionysos, since Alkiphron has Menander exclaim in a letter “May it be my lot always to be crowned with a wreath of Attic ivy and every year to raise my voice in honour of Dionysos of the Hearth”.

59

23

The procession, *eisagoge*, mentioned in the inscriptions was connected with the City Dionysia and seems to have preceded the actual festival,

which began with a *pompe*.

60

The statue of Dionysos Eleuthereus was brought from his temple at the theatre, on the south slope of the Acropolis, to a small shrine near the Academy.

61

The *eschara* has usually been thought to have been situated in this sanctuary and the sacrifices mentioned in IG II² 1011 must have taken place here before the god was brought back to the theatre again.

62

Recently, it has been suggested that the *eschara* mentioned in the inscriptions should be identified with a low altar near the altar of the Twelve Gods in the Athenian Agora, which has been considered as being a typical *eschara*, owing to its low height.

63

This altar was built at the end of the 6th century BC and its construction has been linked to changes in the ritual scheme of the City Dionysia during the same period.

64

According to the excavators, the altar went out of use in the Hellenistic period and could therefore theoretically be equated with the *eschara* of Dionysos mentioned in the late-2nd-century BC inscriptions. However, a new analysis of the stratigraphy in the area between the low altar and the altar of the Twelve Gods indicates that the northern part of the low altar, which is not preserved, was overlaid in c. 430–420 BC by a wall.

65

This seems to exclude the possibility of the low altar still being visible and in use in the 2nd century BC.

66

24

In any case, judging from the inscriptions, it is clear that the term *eschara* in this context refers to an altar, used for sacrifices, which was probably located in a sanctuary. The term for the sacrificial activity in IG II² 1011 is *thyein* and there is no reason to assume that these sacrifices did not include ritual dining before the ephebes brought Dionysos back to the city for the actual festival.

67

25

A fragmentary inscription dating to c. 200 BC from Priene concerning

the sale of the priesthood of Poseidon Helikonios mentions a [---ἱερ]ᾶν ἐσχά[ραν---], unfortunately without sufficient context to establish more precisely what kind of *eschara* this was.

68

The restoration of *eschara* is quite certain, but the word preceding it does not necessarily have to be ἱερᾶν. If the restoration of the *eschara* as sacred is correct, it is possible that the term refers to an altar.

69

However, the *eschara* could have been a part of the kitchen facilities of the sanctuary of Poseidon, as seems to have been the case in a fragmentary inscription from Smyrna dating from the late 2nd to the early 3rd century AD.

70

This text deals with the construction or repair of a *hieron*, probably belonging to a cultic association. A μαγειρεῖον is mentioned, as well as an amount of lead, maybe to repair the roof, and finally an *eschara* (line 9). Louis Robert interpreted the *eschara* as a low altar to be used for sacrifices to chthonian divinities.

71

Since the stone is damaged, we cannot know for certain, but since a *mageireion* is mentioned, it is more plausible that the *eschara* was a regular grill, housed in the kitchen where the sacrificial meals were prepared, rather than an altar.

26

From this review of the epigraphical evidence it is clear that the term *eschara* was mainly used to designate a hearth or a grill, often portable and made of metal. Only a handful of the *escharai* mentioned can be interpreted as altars of a permanent kind. They form a small and dispersed group belonging to a range of deities: the Herakleidai and Dionysos, and possibly Athena and Poseidon. The *Herakleidon* *eschara* inscription is interesting for several reasons. It is the only evidence for a connection between heroes and *escharai* in the epigraphical record. Furthermore, the inscription is the earliest epigraphical mention of an *eschara* likely to refer to some kind of altar or sacrificial installation (4th century BC), since the interpretation of the Lindian rock-cut inscriptions as alluding to *escharai* remains doubtful.

27

These *escharai*/altars also had different appearances. That of the

Herakleidai was perhaps simply an ash-heap marked by a *horos*, while the *eschara* of Dionysos was placed in a sanctuary and may have been more monumental. If the inscriptions at the Lindian acropolis refer to *escharai*, these consisted of the bare rock or were constructed of loose stones for the occasion.

1.1.2. Escharon

28

The term ἑσχαρών occurs only in inscriptions from Delos, a total number of 13 cases, dating from the early 3rd to the mid-2nd century BC.

72

Fernand Robert argued that *escharon* was to be understood as a large *eschara*.

73

The word is usually explained, owing to the value of the locative suffix -ών, as being a place where an *eschara* is to be found or housed.

74

The *escharones* must be understood as rooms or buildings, owing to the constructions or restorations mentioned in the inscriptions. Roofs were built with reeds or tiles, new doors were installed and the area was occasionally cleaned.

75

An *escharon* must have contained some kind of hearth or fire, *eschara*, which could have been used for sacrifices, but also for preparing meals either in religious or more profane contexts.

29

Most of the *escharones* mentioned in the inscriptions cannot be connected with any particular building or sanctuary. Those which are identified or for which it is possible to suggest an identification, are found at different locations: the Archegesion, the Dioskourion and the Sarapeion C (see Table 1).

76

Of major interest is the *escharon* situated in the Archegesion, since this was the sanctuary of a hero, Archegetes or Anios. IG XI:2 156 A, 23–24 (early 3rd century), mentions the construction of the wall of the *escharon* in the *temenos* of Archegetes (οικοδομήσαντι τον τοίχο [ν τ]οῦ ἑσχαρώνος του ἐν τῷ τεμένει του Ἀρχηγέτου).

77

The excavation of the Archegesion has revealed that the sanctuary consisted of two structures: to the west, a walled, rectangular courtyard with a peristyle, in the centre of which was found a heap of ashes, and to the east, an oblong building divided into a series of rooms (Fig. 2).

Table 1. Instances of *eschara* and *escharon* in the epigraphical sources.

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐσχάρα	Herakleidae, Attica	IG II ² 4977	4th century BC
ἐσχάρα	Poseidon: Helikonios, Friene	Hiller von Gaertingen 1906, no. 202a, 37	c. 200 BC
ἐσχάρα	Dionysos, Athens	Reinmuth 1855, 228, line 15	127/6 BC
ἐσχάρα	Dionysos, Athens	IG II ² 1006, 12	123/2 BC
ἐσχάρα	Dionysos, Athens	IG II ² 1008, 15	119/8 BC
ἐσχάρα	Dionysos, Athens	IG II ² 1011, 11	107/6 BC
προσχαράς (ἐσχάρα)	Athena at Lindos, Rhodes	Blinkenberg 1941, 699–906 (for the nos. see p. 32, n. 51)	Late 5th to early 3rd century BC
ἐσχαρῶν	Archegetes, Delos	IG XI/2 156 A, 23	Early 3rd century BC
ἐσχαρῶν	Dioskouroi, Delos	IG XI/2 144 A, 61	303 BC
ἐσχαρῶν	Sarapis, Delos	ID 1416 A, col. I, 36	157/6–156/5 BC
ἐσχαρῶν	Sarapis, Delos	ID 1417 B, col. I, 37	157/6–156/5 BC
ἐσχαρῶν	Sarapis, Delos	ID 1452 A, 29	c. 140 BC

Eschara has been included only when it is possible that the term refers to an altar. Instances of *escharon* in which the recipient is unknown have not been included.

The ash-heap, usually interpreted as an ash-altar, has generally been identified as the *escharon*.

The functions of the two structures are difficult to discern in detail, since the sanctuary awaits its full publication. Animal sacrifices may have taken place in the courtyard with the ash-altar, where the worshippers could have watched the rituals from the peristyle.

Apart from the ash-heap, a rectangular construction in the western part of the courtyard may also have served as an altar or a bench for the deposition of votives or of food offerings, or perhaps for the carving of meat.

Since the rooms in the oblong building were equipped with drains for cleaning the floors, they were probably dining-rooms and have been identified with the *oikoi* mentioned in a mid-3rd-century inscription.

The peristyle of the rectangular courtyard may also have been used for ritual dining: it had a drain in the south-western corner and among the finds were a large number of drinking cups, as well as an *obelos* of iron.




Fig. 2. Plan of the Archegeion, Delos. Modified after Robert F. 1953, 11, fig. 1.

The *escharon* in the Dioskourion is mentioned in *IG XI:2 144 A*, 61 (303 BC). The identification of the sanctuary with the complex no. 123 has been accepted by most scholars.

Roux suggested that the *escharon* should be identified with the Temple A and that this building was the same one as the *hestiatorion* and the *naos* mentioned in other, later inscriptions concerning the Dioskourion.

He further argues that the main function of this structure was to serve as a dining-hall, equipped with tables and couches, and that the designation of this building varied through time, though the function remained the same.

The confinement of the term *escharon* to Delos seems to indicate that it was a local term for a place or building housing some kind of fire or

hearth. Structures containing hearths found in sanctuaries are usually understood as dining-rooms, *hestiatoria*, and the *escharones* in the Archegeion and the Dioskourion can both be interpreted as having been used for that kind of activity. The term *escharon* could thus be taken as a Delian term for a *hestiatorion*. A further indication of *escharon* meaning a dining-hall may be found in two inscriptions recording the inventories stored in the Oikos of the Andrians. Here are listed various objects that have been brought from the *Escharon*.

87

The location of this *Escharon* is unknown and it is difficult to judge how many of the objects following this heading should actually be considered as having been brought from that location. Some of the objects listed, however, such as a *rhyton*, cauldrons, *escharai* (here probably referring to portable hearths or grills) and cooking pots, are suitable equipment for a building used for dining.

88

1.2. Literary sources

1.2.1. *Eschara* in the Archaic to early Hellenistic sources

34

In Homer, *eschara* is used for the household hearth and never as referring to an altar. A sacrifice can be performed on the hearth of the house, however, as Eumaios does in the *Odyssey* in connection with a meal.

89

35

The earliest instances of *eschara* meaning purely an altar are to be found in Aischylos, Sophokles, Euripides and Aristophanes (Table 2).

90

By this period, the term had taken on a more specific meaning, apart from that of a hearth and a place for the fire. It has been suggested that the language of the tragedians was a special case, since the words used in drama may have been deliberately chosen to echo a mythical past or at least to be more venerable than contemporaneous Greek.

91

Even if that was the case and the language of the poets was likely to have been more varied and to have contained more unusual words

than prose texts, the meaning of the term *eschara* must still have been intelligible to the audience.

Table 2. Instances of *eschara* in the Archaic to early Hellenistic literary sources.

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἑσχαῖραι	Apollon	Adespota fr. 991 (Page 1962)	Archaic
ἑσχαῖρα	Apollon	Aesch. <i>Pers.</i> 205	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Erinyes	Aesch. <i>Eum.</i> 108	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	–	Soph. <i>Ant.</i> 1016	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	–	Soph. fr. 38 (Radt 1977)	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρον	–	Soph. fr. 730 (Radt 1977)	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	The gods	Eur. <i>Alc.</i> 119	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	Apollon	Eur. <i>Andr.</i> 1102	5th century BC
βωμῶν ἑσχαῖραι	Apollon	Eur. <i>Andr.</i> 1138	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Apollon	Eur. <i>Andr.</i> 1240	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Zeus	Eur. <i>Herac.</i> 121	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Zeus	Eur. <i>Herac.</i> 127	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Zeus	Eur. <i>Herac.</i> 341	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Zeus	Eur. <i>HF</i> 922	5th century BC
βωμῶν ἑσχαῖραι	–	Eur. <i>Phoen.</i> 274	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	Apollon	Eur. <i>Phoen.</i> 284	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	Demeter and Kore	Eur. <i>Supp.</i> 33	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	Demeter	Eur. <i>Supp.</i> 290	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Apollon	Eur. <i>Supp.</i> 1203	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	<i>Daimones</i>	Eur. fr. 628 (Nauck 1869)	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	Olympian gods	Ar. <i>At.</i> 1232	5th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	–	Xen. <i>Cyr.</i> 8.3.12	4th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Demeter and Kore	Dem. [<i>In Neaor.</i>] 116	4th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	–	Lycurg. fr. 6.10 (Conomis 1970)	4th century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Poseidon Hekitonios	Kleidemos <i>FGHHist</i> 323F1	4th century BC

Only cases in which the term is used in a religious context have been included.

There is no support in the tragedies and comedies for the notion that *eschara* was particularly connected with heroes. In fact, it is not possible to connect *eschara* with any particular kind of divinity. Furthermore, the distinction between *eschara* and *bomos* as two types of altars used for different kinds of rituals is not reflected in the 5th-century sources.

A closer look at the usage of *eschara* shows that in several cases the same altar is called both *eschara* and *bomos*, as well as *thymele* in one instance.

93

The choice of term is not connected with the part of the drama in which it occurs, since *eschara* is found in both the regular text and the chorus parts. Since the terms could be used interchangeably, the variations in terminology may rather be explained by a wish to avoid repetitious language or as being demanded by the metre. A further indication of the connection between *eschara* and *bomos* is the addition of the adjective *bomios*, meaning “of an altar”, to the *eschara*.

94

If an *eschara* could be a part of a *bomos*, it is less likely that it also formed a separate category of altar.

38

Only in one case, in the *Antigone* of Sophokles (1016), are *bomoi* and *escharai* mentioned side by side. Considering the variations in the denominations of altars in the dramas, this single instance should not necessarily be taken as an indication that the two words corresponded to two types of altar. The context in the *Antigone* is Teiresias' complaint that the town's altars are full of the flesh of the unburied son of Oidipous, brought there by birds and dogs (1016–1018). Altars covered with this type of filth constituted a grave situation, and the poet may have wanted to underline the fact that it included all the altars in the city and thus chose to use two words instead of one to emphasize his point. In any case, there is no indication that these *escharai* and *bomoi* belonged to different divinities or were used for different kinds of rituals.

39

If we continue with the question to whom the *escharai* were dedicated or in whose cult they were used, it is clear that there is a broad variety, which does not include the heroes. The Olympian gods as a group could receive a sacrifice on an *eschara*.

95

Apollon, Zeus, Demeter and Kore are specifically named.

96

The *daimones* and the Erinyes also have *escharai*.

97

It may have been a pure coincidence that just these particular

divinities had an *eschara* or there may have been something inherent in their character or cult that made the poet choose this term to designate the altar. The first explanation seems more plausible, since, in some cases, the *escharai* of these divinities are also called by other terms.

40

There is no pattern indicating that any particular rituals were connected with the use of the *eschara*. In most cases, there is no information on what kinds of sacrifices the *eschara* was used for, since this is just mentioned in passing or the *eschara* was being employed for a type of activity different from sacrifice, such as supplication. In any case, there is a certain amount of variation in the rituals performed on or at the *eschara*. Some of the sacrifices performed or alluded to appear to have been regular *thysiai*, i.e., the burning of the god's portion followed by the consumption of the meat by the worshippers.

98

The burning of the god's portion is especially clear from Aristophanes' *Birds* (1231–1233). Iris is about to urge mankind to sacrifice to the Olympian gods and slay sheep on the *escharai* used for hecatombs and fill the streets with sacrificial smoke: θύειν τοῖς Ὀλυμπίοις θεοῖς μῆλοσφαγεῖν τε βουθύτοις ἐπ' ἐσχάrais κνισᾶν τ' ἀγνιάς.

99

41

A sacrifice to purify the house after a murder takes place on the *eschara* of Zeus, but later in the passage the same altar is called *bomos* and the ritual that follows has the components of a *thysia* sacrifice.

100

The use of the term *eschara* for the altar of Zeus may depend on the circumstance that this altar, being the house-altar of Zeus, formed the centre of the house and in that aspect had a function related to the *hestia*.

101

In the *Suppliant Women* by Euripides (1196–1202), Athena instructs Theseus on how to perform an oath sacrifice in a tripod placed next to the *eschara* of Apollon at Delphi. However, the *eschara* itself is not used for the ritual, only the tripod.

42

The only cases in which a clearly different kind of sacrifice is being performed on an *eschara* are the wineless libations (*choai aoinoi* and *nephalia meligmata*) and the nightly *deipna* that Klytaimnestra has sacrificed to the Erinyes in order to seek revenge (Aesch. *Eum.* 106–109). This is a sacrifice removed from the sphere of the *thysia* and does not include any collective dining. It is questionable, however, whether the mention of the *eschara* in this case should be explained by the fact that this was a particular kind of sacrifice, since the *escharai* could also be used for regular *thysiai*. Moreover, in the *Persians* (202–204), Atossa sacrifices *pelanos* on a *bomos* to the powers that avert evil, *apotropoi daimones*, a sacrifice similar to that made by Klytaimnestra.

43

Thus, it is clear that the tragedians and Aristophanes do not connect *eschara* with a particular kind of divinity or with it being used for a special type of ritual. In what sense do they use the term? In most cases, it is the equivalent of an entire altar that is referred to, since sacrifices are performed on the *eschara* and the same sacrificial installation is also called *bomos*. More specifically, the term seems to have meant the upper part of the altar where the fire was kept, since bömioi ἑσχαῖραι the texts speak of βωμοῦ ἑσχάρα and βώμιοι ἑσχαῖραι.

102

This area was the most important part of an altar and the denomination *eschara* would then function as a *pars pro toto*. It is useful to remember that one of the original meanings of *bomos*, besides “altar”, was “base”.

103

44

The relationship between *eschara* and *bomos* and how the terms could be used to vary the text are well illustrated by Euripides’ *Andromache* (1085–1165). The context is the killing of Neoptolemos in Delphi and the passage contains references to *eschara* and *bomos* as altars. The *eschara* mentioned has sometimes been assumed to refer to an altar situated inside the temple of Apollon, since Pausanias was there shown the *hestia* where Neoptolemos was killed, next to the iron chair of Pindar (10.24.5). If the text of Euripides is read carefully, it is clear that Neoptolemos moves between various spots during the tragic

event. A neat explanation of his whereabouts has been offered by J. Pouilloux and G. Roux.

104

Neoptolemos arrives at the *escharai* mentioned in line 1102 in order to sacrifice. According to Pouilloux and Roux, this altar must be understood as situated in front of the temple. Then Neoptolemos enters the temple and is performing a sacrifice (1113) when he is attacked and withdraws to the entrance and climbs the *bomos* in front of the temple (1123). He makes his impressive Trojan jump from the top of this altar, the *bomou eschara* (1138). Finally he returns into the temple and is killed beside an altar, *bomos*, situated there (1156). Euripides may very well have used the extant topography of the Delphi of his own time, when he wrote the tragedy. If one interprets the text with this in mind, the *eschara* must refer to an altar where the present altar of the Chians is standing. The two mentions of *eschara* fit the picture well. In the first instance (1102), the term *escharai* refers to the whole altar in front of the temple where the sheep are to be sacrificed, while in the second passage (1138), the *bomou eschara* is the part of the altar that Neoptolemos jumps from, i.e., the upper part, where the fire was to be placed.

45

An *eschara* of Apollon at Delphi also occurs in the *Suppliant Women* (1200). Here an oath is taken by the Argives, and the throats of three sheep are cut above a tripod placed next to the *eschara*. It is unlikely that a sacrifice of this kind would take place inside the temple. Thus the *eschara* must refer to an altar situated outside the temple, presumably at the same location as the altar of the Chians.

46

The remaining passages, dating to before 300 BC, in which *eschara* is used are more difficult to grasp, since the term occurs only once in each text and some of these have been preserved only in a heavily abbreviated form.

47

A speech ascribed to Demosthenes mentions the *eschara* of Demeter and Kore in the courtyard at Eleusis, where the hierophant Archias sacrificed (ἱερεῖον θύσειεν) during the Haloa festival, although animal victims were prohibited on that occasion and it was the priestess who was to perform the sacrifice.

105

It is possible that the *eschara* in the Demosthenic speech is the same as the *escharai* mentioned by Euripides (*Supp.* 33 and 290). Lykourgos apparently used the term *eschara* in his speech concerning a priestess, presumably that of Athena Polias, but nothing further is known of the context in which the term was mentioned.

106

Kleidemos, briefly quoted by a much later source, mentions an *eschara* of Poseidon Helikonios at Agrai, in the Ilissos area at Athens.

107

48

Finally, a non-Greek example may be added. In his description of the sacrificial procession of Kyros, Xenophon mentions a large *eschara*, topped with a fire and carried by several men.

108

Whether this *eschara* was used as an altar or simply as a substantial incense-burner is impossible to tell from the context.

1.2.2. *Eschara* in the post-300 BC sources

49

Most of the later sources mention *eschara* only once (Table 3). The picture presented is quite disparate as regards the appearance of the *escharai*, the rituals performed and the recipients, but most of the characteristics of the *escharai* of the earlier sources can also be traced in the later sources. What should be noted is that in the post-300 BC literary sources can be found the first direct connections between *escharai* and heroes, as well as the notion that *escharai* and *bomoi* constituted two different kinds of altars.

50

The earliest evidence for an *eschara* as a particular kind of hero-cult altar is found in Neanthes of Kyzikos (3rd century BC), who is quoted as saying “*bomoi* are for the gods and *escharai* for the heroes”.

109

Neanthes is a good example of how complex the source situation occasionally is. His information is explicit, but highly abbreviated, and is preserved as quotations in two stages by later sources.

110

It is impossible to tell whether Neanthes is implying that the distinction in altars also meant a distinction in rituals between gods and heroes. Still, Neanthes is particularly interesting, since he is the

only literary source before the Roman period making a direct connection between heroes and *escharai*.

Table 3. Instances of *eschara* in the post-300 BC literary sources.

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἑσχαῖραι	Heroes	Nearthes <i>FGHHist</i> 34F7	3rd century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	—	Kallixeinos <i>FGHHist</i> 627 F2	3rd century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Ares	Ap. Rhod. <i>Argon.</i> 2.1170	3rd century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Ares	Ap. Rhod. <i>Argon.</i> 2.1175	3rd century BC
ἑσχαῖρα	Ge Olympia	Polemon <i>PHG</i> III, 136, F75	2nd century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	—	Ammorios <i>FGHHist</i> 351 F1a	2nd–1st century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	Alexander	Diod. Sic. 13.61.1	1st century BC
ἑσχαῖραι	Zeus Astrapaiois	Strabon 9.2.11	1st century BC to 1st century AD
ἑσχαῖρα	Jahve	Joseph. <i>AJ</i> 3.148	1st century AD
ἑσχαῖρα	Jahve	Joseph. <i>AJ</i> 3.149	1st century AD
ἑσχαῖρα	Zeus Herkeios	Faus. 4.17.4	2nd century AD
ἑσχαῖρα	—	Faus. 5.13.9	2nd century AD
ἑσχαῖρα	Zeus Herkeios	Faus. 10.27.2	2nd century AD
ἑσχαῖραι βωμῶν	The gods	Dicg. Laert. 4.56	3rd century AD
ἑσχαῖραι	—	Porph. <i>Abst.</i> 2.36.4	3rd century AD
ἑσχαῖρα	Chthonian divinities and the heroes	Porph. <i>De antr. nymph.</i> 6	3rd century AD
ἑσχαῖραι	Egyptian gods	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 1.10.4	3rd century AD
ἑσχαῖρα	Apollo, Pythios, Artemis, Aphrodite and the Erotes	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 4.10.5	3rd century AD

Only cases in which the term is used in a religious context have been included.

Porphyrios (*De antr. nymph.* 6), a substantially later source, stated that the Olympian gods had temples and *bomoi*, the chthonian gods and heroes *escharai*, the hypochthonian gods *bothroi* and *megara* and the Kosmos caves and grottoes (ὥς γὰρ τοῖς μὲν Ὀλυμπίοις θεοῖς ναοὺς τε καὶ ἔδη καὶ βωμοὺς ἰδρύσαντο, χθονίοις δὲ καὶ ἥρωσιν ἑσχάρας, ὑποχθονίοις δὲ βόθρους καὶ μέγαλα, οὕτω καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἄντρα τε καὶ σπήλαια). There is no mention of different kinds of rituals being connected with the various types of altars and sacred places. In this case, there are no complexities in the transmission of the text, but, on the other hand, the contents are coloured by the philosophical climate of the period in which Porphyrios lived. The hierarchical arrangement of the deities into these specific groups (Olympian, chthonian, heroes and

hypochthonian) is in accordance with the Neoplatonic view of the cosmos, formulated in the 3rd century AD, and therefore not necessarily valid also for earlier periods.

111

52

Most of the post-300 BC sources, however, mention the *escharai* in connection with gods: Ares, Ge Olympia, Zeus Astrapaaios, Zeus Herkeios and the gods in general. The *eschara* of Ares referred to by Apollonios Rhodios is described as being built of pebbles and used by the Argonauts for a regular *thysia* sacrifice of sheep, followed by a meal.

112

The Amazons, when they came to the sanctuary of Ares, were not allowed to sacrifice sheep and oxen and burn the *hiera* on this *eschara*, but only horses, which they cut up and, apparently, ate (ἀλλ'ἵππους δαίτρευσον, lines 1174–1177).

53

The *escharai* of Ge Olympia and Zeus Astrapaaios were both permanent installations, but there is no information on the sacrifices that took place at these altars. From the *eschara* near the temple of Ge Olympia outside the walls of Syracuse, mentioned by Polemon, a kylix was brought out to sea and dropped in the water.

113

The *eschara* of Zeus Astrapaaios in Athens was used by the Pythaistai when they watched the sky for signs of lightning.

114

The use of *eschara* for the altar of Zeus Herkeios, noted previously in Euripides (*HF* 922), is found also in Pausanias, when he describes the killing of Priamos by Neoptolemos.

115

54

The more specific meaning of *eschara* as the upper part of the *bomos*, where the fire is kept, is used by Diogenes Laertios (4.56), in describing a man beginning desperately to sacrifice when he fell ill and death was approaching. He feasted the noses of the gods with greasy smoke, fat and meal broth, not only over the *eschara* of the *bomoi*, but also over the sacred table(οὐ μοῦνον ἐσχάρης ὕπερ βωμῶν τε καὶ τραπέζης κνίση, λίπει, θυλήμασιν θεῶν ἔδαισε ῥῖνας).

Flavius Josephus describes a bronze altar (*bomos*) crowned by an *eschara* resembling a network, through which the burning fuel fell to the ground.

117

Eschara could also be the upper part of a *hestia*, as in Heliodoros (*Aeth.* 4.18.6). For lack of a proper altar, a priest lights τὴν ... ἐστίαν ἐσχάραν to be used as a *bomos* and burns frankincense at an oath sacrifice when Apollon Pythios, Artemis, Aphrodite and the Erotes are evoked.

118

55

In the later sources are also mentioned *escharai* that seem to have been portable and functioned more or less as incense-burners. Two, gigantic, gilt *escharai* of this kind were carried in the *pompe* of Ptolemaios II in Alexandria, according to the 3rd century historian Kallixeinos.

119

Eschara is used by Diodorus Siculus to designate an altar on which Alexander's generals sacrificed to him as a god after his death.

120

This portable *eschara*, with a fire, is brought into the tent where the generals are meeting and they burn frankincense on it. The upper part of an incense altar in the tabernacle at Jerusalem is called *eschara* by Flavius Josephus.

121

56

Eschara is thus used for the whole altar and, more particularly, the upper part of the *bomos*, as well as for an incense-burner that could be used for sacrifices. The basic meaning of *eschara* is still "hearth" or "the place for the fire", both of which could be used for sacrificial purposes. In this context should be considered an interesting piece of information provided by Pausanias. In discussing the ash-altar (*bomos tephros*) of Zeus at Olympia, he compares it with the ash-altar of Hera on Samos, which, he says, is no more conspicuous than what the Athenians call improvised *escharai* (αὐτοσχεδίας Ἀθηναῖοι καλοῦσιν ἐσχάρας).

122

These Athenian *escharai* mentioned by Pausanias are likely to have had a religious function, not being just any kind of hearths or fire-

places. It is possible to imagine them as simple altars or sites for sacrifices, probably not consisting of anything more elaborate than the remains of the debris from previous sacrifices, just like the ash-altars of Zeus at Olympia and that of Hera on Samos. These two ash-altars, however, seem to have been more substantial, since they had been in use for a long time, and particularly the altar of Zeus had acquired monumental proportions in the course of time. Pausanias' statement that the Athenians use the expression *autoschediai escharai* for ash-altars of this kind may be taken as an indication that this was the Athenian terminology for a kind of altar that in other regions would be called a *bomos tephros*. It is interesting to note that all the other altars mentioned by Pausanias in the same section are called *bomoi*, even though they were made of ashes or, as in one case, of the blood of the animal victims.

123

57

The use of *eschara* for a simple kind of altar is probably what is alluded to by the Athenian *Kultschriftsteller* Ammonios of Lamptrai (prob. 2nd–1st centuries BC), who wrote a study of altars and sacrifices, *Περὶ βωμῶν καὶ θυσιῶν*, which is preserved only in occasional fragments in later sources.

124

Of particular interest as regards *eschara* is the information quoted in the *Περὶ ὁμοίων καὶ διαφορῶν λέξεων*,

125

where it is stated that, according to Ammonios, there is a difference between *bomos*, *hestia* and *eschara*. Ammonios is quoted as saying that “*bomoi*, on the one hand, have bases, while *eschara* is what is established on the ground for regular use, and the elaborate ones are called *hestiai*, while *megaron* is a *hestia* enclosed in a building”

126

. The original text by Ammonios has probably been abbreviated and the only thing that can be said definitely is that Ammonios indicates that there was a difference between *bomos* and *eschara* regarding the appearance. It seems probable that *eschara*, in this context, refers to an altar or a location where sacrifices took place, not just a hearth or a place for a fire.

58

Considering the information found in Ammonios and Pausanias, it

seems as if *eschara* could also, at least from the Hellenistic period onwards, refer to a simple altar, with an appearance different from a *bomos*, particularly in Attica. A final passage to be mentioned will be found in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodoros (1.18.4). The text describes the temple of Isis at Memphis, where the *bomoi* and *escharai* were full of all kinds of animals, dripping with blood.

127

If we are to understand the terms as meaning two kinds of altars, they were both found in the same temple and received the same kind of offerings.

1.2.3. *Eschara* in the explicatory sources

59

The division between the later and the explicatory sources regarding the term *eschara* is not so self-evident, since some post-300 BC sources, for example, Neanthes and Ammonios, are only preserved as quotations in an abbreviated form in explicatory sources. It is interesting to note that the term *eschara* is found in a large number of explicatory sources, i.e., this was a word that needed explanation (Table 4). Many of these sources quote each other without any comments of their own.

60

Three major points are made in the explicatory sources: (1) a connection between *eschara* and heroes, (2) a polarisation between *eschara* and *bomos* as regards the appearance and mode of construction, and (3) an indication that the earlier sources did not always use the terms in this fashion. At the same time, many explicatory sources indicate that there was a certain overlap in the use of the terms *bomos* and *eschara*.

61

As mentioned previously, the combination of heroes and *eschara* is first encountered in the 3rd-century BC historian Neanthes, quoted in the *Perihomoion kai diaphoron lexeon*. Ptolemaios of Askalon, a source which can be dated either to the 2nd century BC or the 2nd century AD, says in his *Περὶ διαφορᾶς λέξεων* that the *bomoi* of the heroes were called *escharai*.

128

This work, however, is probably one of the variants of the *Peri*

homoion kai diaphoron lexeon, and even if the information given by Ptolemaios differs in certain aspects from that found in the latter source, it is possible that his statement also goes back to Neanthes.

129

More straightforward is Pollux, who states that “*eschara* seems especially to be called that on which we sacrifice to the heroes”.

130

Finally, in a scholion to the *Phoenician Maidens* by Euripides, it is said that *eschara* is mainly the *bothros* on the ground where they perform *enagizein* sacrifices to those going down, while *bomos* is that on which they perform *thysia* sacrifices to the heavenly gods.

131

Οἱ νάτω ἐρχόμενοι should probably be taken as referring to the departed, since *katerchomai* can mean “to go down to the grave”.

132

Even though such a group could include the heroes, since they were dead, it seems more likely that it refers only to the ordinary dead.

Table 4. Instances of *eschara* in the explicatory literary sources.

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐσχαρά	–	Ap. Soph. <i>Lex. Hom.</i> s.v. ἐσχαρά (Bekker 1833, 78)	c. 100 AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Harp. s.v. ἐσχαρά (Dindorf 1853)	2nd century AD
ἐσχαρά	Heroes	Poll. <i>Onom.</i> 1.7–8 (Bethe 1900–31)	2nd century AD
ἐσχαρά	Heroes	Ptol. <i>Ascal.</i> s.v. βωμός (Heylbut 1887, 398)	2nd century BC to 2nd century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Hsch. s.v. ἐσχαρά (Latte 1953–66, E. 6446)	5th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Steph. Byz. s.v. βωμοί (Meinecke 1849)	6th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Phot. <i>Lex.</i> s.v. ἐστία (Theodoridis 1982–98, E. 2025)	9th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Phot. <i>Lex.</i> s.v. ἐσχαρά (Theodoridis 1982–98, E. 2041)	9th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Phot. <i>Lex.</i> s.v. ἐσχαρά (Theodoridis 1982–98, E. 2042)	9th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	<i>Suda</i> s.v. ἐσχαρά (Adler 1928–35, E. 3242)	10th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	<i>Etym. Gud.</i> s.v. ἐστία 1 (Sturz 1818)	11th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	<i>Etym. Magn.</i> s.v. ἐσχαρά (Gaisford 1848)	12th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Eust. <i>Il.</i> 10.418 (van der Valk 1979, vol. 3, 101)	12th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Eust. <i>Od.</i> 6.305 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 255)	12th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Eust. <i>Od.</i> 7.153 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 270)	12th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Eust. <i>Od.</i> 14.159 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 2, 68)	12th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	<i>Anecd. Bekk.</i> s.v. ἐσχαρά (Bekker 1814, vol. 1, 256–257)	13th century AD
ἐσχαρά	–	Schol. ad Aesch. <i>Pers.</i> 203 (Dindorf 1851; Massa Positano 1963)	–
ἐσχαρά	–	Schol. ad Aesch. <i>Pers.</i> 205b (Massa Positano 1963)	–
ἐσχαρά	–	Schol. ad Aesch. <i>Sept.</i> 73i (Smith 1982)	–
ἐσχαρά	–	Schol. ad Ar. <i>Acch.</i> 888a (Wilson 1975)	–
ἐσχαρά	–	Schol. ad Ar. <i>Eq.</i> 1286a (Jones & Wilson 1969, vet.)	–
ἐσχαρά	–	Schol. ad Ar. <i>Eq.</i> 1286c (Jones & Wilson 1969, rec.)	–

Only cases in which the term is used in a religious context have been included.

Table 4 (continued)

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐσχαρά	–	Schol. ad Ap. Rhod. <i>Argon.</i> 3.1172 (Wendel 1935)	–
ἐσχαρά	Those going down	Schol. ad Eur. <i>Phoen.</i> 274 (Schwartz 1887)	–
ἐσχαρά	Zeus Herkeios	Schol. ad Hom. <i>Il.</i> 16.291 (Erbse 1969–88, vol. 4)	–
ἐσχαρά	–	Schol. ad Hom. <i>Od.</i> 23.71 (Dindorf 1855)	–
ἐσχαρά	–	Schol. ad Opp. <i>Hal.</i> 5.307 (Bussemaker 1849)	–

Only cases in which the term is used in a religious context have been included.

The second point concerns the appearance and construction of the *eschara* and how it differs from *bomos*. The sources commenting upon this are numerous, but they frequently echo each other in chronological order. The information given by each source is often somewhat contradictory of what is said in other sources. The individual source may also contradict itself and it is difficult to picture the kind of installation being described.

The following statements on the differences between *eschara* and *bomos* can be disentangled. The major distinction was the height: a *bomos* was high, while an *eschara* was low and situated on the ground.

133

Regarding the construction, the *bomos* was built up, presumably of stones, and had a proper base.

134

The *eschara* was not constructed of stones and lacked a base.

135

The *eschara* could simply be hollowed out in the ground.

136

The shape is described either as having a square base or as being rounded.

137

An *eschara* seems to be of a less permanent character than a *bomos*, since the term could signify the fire established on the ground for regular use or simply the ashes left behind.

138

There is an evident connection with fire, and *eschara* is often compared with *hestia*, both in the sense of an altar and of a regular hearth, even if the explicatory sources often consider *hestia* as being more elaborate and connected in particular with the hearth of the house or the Prytaneion.

139

This equating of *eschara* with *hestia*, both in appearance and in function, complicates the understanding of *eschara* in the explicatory sources, since it is difficult to ascertain whether the *eschara* mentioned is an altar or a plain hearth. Some of the explanations may be based on the appearance of household hearths, which could be used for sacrifices in some situations. In any case, whether the *escharai* mentioned in these sources were used as altars or not, it

seems clear that they were understood as simple installations placed directly on the ground or in a hole in the ground, consisting mainly of the remains of the fire. In this aspect, *eschara* corresponds to the ash-altars mentioned by Ammonios and Pausanias. In general, the distinction between *eschara* as a simple altar, contrasted with *bomos* in the sense of a built-up altar is more obvious in the explicatory sources. The remark that *escharai* could be hollow or sunk into the ground is understandable, considering that cooking pits could be dug into the ground.

140

The particular characteristic of an *eschara* being hollow should also be connected with the fact that some explicatory sources give the explanation of *eschara* as being the upper, sunken part of a *bomos*, where the *hiera* or *hiereia* were burnt.

141

64

Moreover, an indication that the *bomos* was especially constructed for sacrifices, while the *eschara* may not have had any sacrificial function at all, is also found in some explicatory sources.

142

Among the other explanations of the term, apart from altar, hearth or place for the fire, are round and hollow wounds on the body, parts of the female genitalia and some kind of stage machinery or construction: all these meanings of the word *eschara* are to be found in the earlier sources.

143

65

That *eschara* was an altar for heroes that looked different from a *bomos*, which was used for the gods, is not compatible with the meaning of the term in the Classical sources. This divergence is commented upon by some explicatory sources. Pollux, after connecting heroes and *escharai*, says that some of the poets have also called the altars of the gods by that term.

144

The *Etymologicum Magnum* states that *eschara* can mean *bomos* and refers to the way in which Euripides uses the term.

145

Eustathios notices that Sophokles and Euripides use *eschara* instead of *bomos*.

146

The *Etymologicum Gudianum* says that *eschara* can be found instead of *bomos*.

147

1.3. Conclusion

66

The term *eschara* had a variety of meanings in the epigraphical and literary sources. The assumption that *eschara* was a special kind of altar for hero-cults and was used for particular rituals cannot be substantiated for the Archaic to early Hellenistic periods. Instead, when *eschara* is used as referring to an altar, the term functions as an equivalent to *bomos* and cannot be connected with any particular deities or rituals.

67

More specifically, the literary sources show that *eschara* meant the upper part of a *bomos*, where the fire was kept. This interpretation of the term finds additional support in its use in the epigraphical material. Several inscriptions from Delos speak of repairs with stucco or plaster of the upper surface of an altar (*thymele*), owing to damage caused by fire.

148

Some preserved altars of marble or limestone are crowned with a heat-resistant material, such as serpentite, gneiss or terracotta, or had such a cover sunk into the upper surface, protecting the stone from being damaged by the fire (Fig. 3).

149

In other cases, the cover seems to have been made of metal, probably bronze.

150

From vase-paintings, it is clear that altars frequently had an upper cover of some kind and that, in some instances, the object shown covering the surface of the altar was presumably made of metal, since it protrudes at a sharp angle from the altar surface (Figs. 4–5).

151

If *eschara* is to be understood as the place for the fire, it is possible that some of the metal *escharai* mentioned in the inscriptions may refer to such metal sheets or pans protecting the upper surfaces of the altars.

152

The metal *eschara* must have rested on an isolating bedding of clay or plaster, which would have further protected the stone from the heat.




Fig. 3. Altar dedicated to Hera crowned by slabs of gneiss to protect the marble from the heat. Sanctuary of Poseidon, Thasos, probably 4th century BC. After Bon & Seyrig 1929, 334, fig. 9.



Fig. 4. Vase-painting of altar equipped with a fire-cover (*eschara*). Athenian red-figure volute-krater, c. 500–480 BC, Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 5. Vase-paintings of altars equipped with fire-covers (*escharai*). (a) Athenian red-figure oinochoe, c. 490–480 BC, Athenian Agora. (b) Athenian red-figure neck amphora, c. 500–480 BC, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.

68

Since these *escharai* are listed among objects kept in storage, they are not likely to have been lying on top of altars when the inventories were made. In fact, the reason why they are mentioned in the inventories was probably that they had been removed. They may have been temporarily taken into storage if the altar was being repaired or permanently if the altar went out of use altogether. Another explanation for the *escharai* being kept in a storage facility, instead of being used, may be that they were broken.

153

69

A connection between *eschara* and hero-cults could be made only in a handful of cases and of these only the *eschara* of the Herakleidai in Attica dates to before 300 BC, while the inscription mentioning the *escharon* in the Archegesion on Delos dates to the early 3rd century BC. The earliest literary source connecting *escharai* and heroes dates to the 3rd century BC, while the rest of the sources making this connection are considerably later.

70

It is important to note that the use of an *eschara* in the cult of the Herakleidai and in the *escharon* in the sanctuary of the Archegetes does not automatically imply that particular kinds of sacrifices

(holocausts, for example) were performed. *Eschara* in these cases is best understood as referring to the altar being of a simple kind, a heap of ashes placed directly on the ground, in the sense that the term is employed in later literary sources, beginning with Ammonios of Lamptrai, and perhaps also in the rock-cut *proscharaios* inscriptions from Lindos. In the Archegesion, the presence of an *eschara* should rather be explained by the sanctuary being used for ritual meals than by the recipient being a hero, since *escharon* seems to have been a Delian term for *hestiatorion*.

154

It is possible that the link between heroes and *escharai* may have originated in the fact that the sanctuaries of heroes, to a certain extent, were of a less elaborate kind than the sanctuaries of the gods and therefore had simple *escharai* where the sacrifices were performed.

155

Neanthes' claim that *escharai* were used for heroes while *bomoi* were for the gods may also be a reflection of such conditions rather than of any distinctions in cult practices between heroes and gods. Furthermore, it is possible that the term *eschara* was, in particular, a local Attic term for these simple altars, which elsewhere would be called *bomoi*, just as *escharon* on Delos seems to have been a local term for *hestiatorion*.

71

The explicatory sources particularly emphasize a distinction between *eschara* and *bomos*, especially concerning differences in the appearances and modes of construction. Even if such a distinction may have existed as early as in the Archaic and Classical periods, it is clear that the explicatory sources focus on the meaning of *eschara* as a hearth, a pit for the fire or a simple altar on the ground.

72

The eagerness of the explicatory sources to distinguish *eschara* from *bomos* may reflect an increased degree of specialization among the altars and the use of the terminology. On the one hand, *escharai* were used in particular for simple, more improvised altars, while *bomoi* were reserved for the altars constructed of stone. On the other hand, *escharai* came to be associated with the heroes, while the *bomoi* were used in the cults of the gods. Why this specialization took place is

hard to tell, but perhaps it should be linked to a greater distinction between heroes and gods in later and especially Roman times.

156

Possibly, there was an increase of particular rituals in hero-cults, especially in holocaustic sacrifices, which led to a higher degree of specialization in the altars and the use of *escharai* in hero-cults.

157

Such a development may also be discernable in the archaeological evidence. For example, the Roman Palaimonion at Isthmia was equipped with a pit where holocaustic sacrifices were performed and such an installation corresponds to the *escharai* of the explicatory sources.

158

Another candidate for a Roman *eschara* used for hero-cults is an ash-filled pit in the agora of Argos, installed in the 4th century AD but which included the re-use of nine limestone posts originating from an Archaic monument dedicated to the heroes who participated in the expedition against Thebes.

159

If a change in ritual practices in hero-cults had taken place in the Roman period, the later and the explicatory sources would reflect the conditions of their own periods and explain the term from its contemporaneous meaning, which is not necessarily valid also for conditions during Archaic and Classical times.

73

It should also be noted that *eschara* is frequently commented upon in the explicatory sources, i.e., this particular term apparently needed explanation. The information found in the lexica and scholia is quite ambiguous and the explanations given are often general. Considering the fact that the use of *eschara* in general in the Roman period and later seems mainly to have been as a medical term, it seems likely that a religious use of *eschara* in the same periods was not very frequent. When the term was explained, it had to be distinguished both from its general meaning of hearth and place for the fire, from the term *hestia*, from the common word for altar, *bomos*, and from the meaning “wound”. The descriptions of *eschara* as low, hollow and connected with fire are very general. As shown above, both fire and hollowness are characteristics of almost all meanings of the term, whether religious or not. Perhaps some of the later commentators

had never seen an *eschara* functioning as an altar and, when they described it, they focused on the general traits of the term, in order to distinguish *eschara* from other phenomena covered by the same term or from similar concepts, such as *bomos* and *hestia*.

160

The distinction between *eschara* and *bomos* and the connection between *escharai* and hero-cults may thus have been the result of the bewilderment of the explicatory sources when faced with the use of *eschara* in the earlier periods, rather than a reflection of the terminology and ritual practices of previous periods.

2. Bothros

74

The meaning of the term *bothros*, according to the *LSJ*, is a hole, trench or pit dug in the ground. The *LSJ* also gives the explanations “hollow”, “grave” and “ritual pit for offerings to the subterranean gods”.

75

The *bothroi* used for ritual purposes have usually been considered as being characteristic of the cult of the heroes, the deceased, the chthonian divinities and the winds, just as *bomos* was a typical feature in the sanctuaries of the gods.

161

In correct use of the language, it has been claimed, *bothros* was distinguished from *eschara*, but such a distinction was not always observed in practice and both kinds of sacrificial installations have been considered as being used in the same cults and for the same kinds of rituals.

162

More specifically, a *bothros* was a sacrificial pit, i.e., a hole in the ground into which libations were poured, the most prominent being the blood of the sacrificial victims.

163

Sacrifices could also be burnt in the *bothros*.

164

The pit could be freshly dug for each occasion or be a permanent construction, which sometimes was raised above the ground level, such as the *bothroi* found in the sanctuaries of deities considered to be

chthonian, like Asklepios.

165

2.1. Epigraphical sources

76

Bothros is a rare term, which seems to be documented only twice in the inscriptions, none of which show any connection with hero-cults (Table 5).

166

The first inscription is an account of expenses from Delos dated to c. 265–255 BC and unfortunately rather damaged.

167

Line 2 mentions a piglet, presumably bought to be used in the purification of a sanctuary.

168

The only words preserved in the next line are. τοὺς βόθρου [ς] – . It is not clear whether the *bothroi* were used in the purification or whether this line refers to a different context. There are two sanctuaries on Delos for which purifications by piglets are known. The sanctuary of Apollon was purified monthly by the blood of a piglet and the purification of the Thesmophorion is mentioned in many accounts.

169

The inscription is too fragmentary for any connection to be made, but it seems likely that the *bothroi* belonged to a ritual context.

170

Table 5. Instances of *bothros* in the epigraphical sources.

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
βόθρου	Unknown, Delos	IG XI:2 235, 3	265–255 BC
βόθρου	Gods of the underworld, Kallipolis	Krauss 1980, no. 11, 35	2nd century AD

77

Term βόγροι Recipient Source Date βόγροι Unknown, Delos IG XI:2 235, 3 265–255 BC Gods of the underworld, Kallipolis Krauss 1980, no. 11, 25 2nd century AD The second inscription using *bothros* is Roman (2nd century AD) and comes from Kallipolis in Thrace.

171

The text records an oracle against pestilence given by the oracle of

Apollon at Klaros. This inscription belongs to a series of oracles, preserved in epigraphical form, given in connection with a plague, which spread in the eastern part of the Roman empire in the second half of the 2nd century AD.

78

At the end of the inscription, the remedies against the plague are outlined (lines 21–33). The people of Kallipolis are “to sacrifice to the gods below the earth”, ἔρδειν ὑπουδαίοις θεοῖς,, a black goat to Hades and a black sheep to Persephone.

172

When the black blood flows into the *bothroi*, a collection of libations and medicines shall be poured out from above. The victims are to be burnt together with fragrant oils and frankincense. Wine and milk shall then be poured on the pyre to extinguish the fire. It is not clear from the text whether the burning is to take place in the *bothros* or next to it.

2.2. Literary sources

2.2.1. *Bothros* in Archaic to early Hellenistic sources

79

Most occurrences of *bothros* in the literary sources refer simply to a hole, dug in the ground without any religious connotations.

173

These holes are sometimes dug for a specific purpose, such as planting vines or olives,

174

burying a corpse

175

or keeping a fire.

176

The common characteristic is that the *bothros* was not a permanent installation but was created when the need arose.

Table 6. Instances of *bothros* in the Archaic to early Hellenistic literary sources.

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
βόθρος	The dead	Hom. <i>Od.</i> 10.517	c. 700 BC
βόθρος	The dead	Hom. <i>Od.</i> 11.25	c. 700 BC
βόθρος	The dead	Hom. <i>Od.</i> 11.36	c. 700 BC
βόθρος	The dead	Hom. <i>Od.</i> 11.42	c. 700 BC
βόθρος	The dead	Hom. <i>Od.</i> 11.95	c. 700 BC

Only cases in which the term is used in a religious context have been included.

80

The religious use of *bothros* in this period is indeed slight, and there is no connection with hero-cults. In all, the evidence seems to be limited to Odysseus' consultation of the souls of the dead in Hades.

177

This *bothros* of a cubit's length is dug by Odysseus with his sword in the bank of the river Akeron. The sacrifice begins with libations: first *melikraton*, then wine and water, followed by the sprinkling of barley meal. Then Odysseus prays and promises the dead the sacrifice of a barren cow on his return to Ithaka, as well as a black sheep to Teiresias. The black ewe and a black ram are slaughtered over the *bothros* and the blood flows into the pit to attract the dead souls (τὰ δὲ μῆλα λαβὼν ἀπεδειροτόμησα ἐς βόθρον, ῥέε δ' αἷμα κελαινεφές).

178

81

Finally, the slaughtered animals are flayed and burnt, while prayers are said to Hades and Persephone. The burning seems to have taken place outside the pit. After the completion of the ritual, Odysseus sits down with his sword in his hand to wait for the souls of the dead to approach, and in particular for Teiresias, who, after having drunk the blood, will proclaim the fate of Odysseus.

82

There is a strong connection with death in this sacrifice and the use of the *bothros* is aimed at putting the person sacrificing in contact with the dead. The ritual is a single occasion. The atmosphere of the sacrifice has a temporary character, which is further stressed by the fact that it takes place away from society and outside the boundaries

marking the area where regular sacrifices are performed. The *bothros* was not a permanent installation but was dug just for this particular occasion. There is a closeness to water, and the pit is dug on the shore. The offerings that go into the *bothros* are all fluid: *melikraton*, wine, water and blood. Any burning takes place outside the pit. After the ritual is finished, the participants leave without any indication of returning.

83

That a *bothros* is used in a ritual to evoke the dead is hardly surprising, considering the fact that the dead were imagined as remaining underground and that the burial itself took place in a hole in the ground. A further indication of the close connection between *bothros* and death/burial is found in a fragment of the tragedian Ion. He mentions, in a non-Greek context, that particular *bothroi* were used in the mourning of the dead and that the mourners presumably descended into them.

179

2.2.2. *Bothros* in the post-300 BC sources

84

In the later sources, the use of *bothros* in religious contexts is more frequent and a connection with heroes is also found, the earliest cases being in Pausanias. It is striking that many of the contexts in which a *bothros* is used show similarities to the sacrifice performed by Odysseus in the *Nekyia* of Homer, as regards the recipients of the sacrifice, the aim of the ritual and the actual ritual actions performed.

85

Some of these later passages are direct references to Homer and the *Nekyia* and need no further comment here.

180

Other instances describe a ritual that is almost a copy or a paraphrase of Homer, even though single details differ or the order varies, in which the separate actions are carried out. When Lucian tells the story of how Menippos wanted to visit Hades with the aid of the Chaldean Mithrobarzanes, the ritual described must be considered as copied almost exactly from Homer but with a slightly ironic twist.

181

Menippos and his Chaldean friend drifted along the river Euphrates

into a marsh to a woody, sunless place, dug a *bothros*, slaughtered the sheep and sprinkled the blood around it, βόθρον τε ὠρυξάμετα καὶ τὰ μήλα κατεσφάξαμεν καὶ τὸ αἷμα περὶ αὐτὸν ἐσπείσαμεν. Philostratos is perhaps also somewhat ironic, when he states that Apollonios managed to get into contact with Achilles, even though he did not dig a *bothros*, like Odysseus, or tempted the souls with the blood of sheep.

Table 7. Instances of *bothros* in the post-300 BC literary sources. Term Recipient Source

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
βόθρος	The dead	Lycoph. <i>Alex.</i> 684	Early 3rd century BC
βόθρος	Hekate	Ap. Rhod. <i>Argon.</i> 3.1032–1034	3rd century BC
βόθρος	Hekate	Ap. Rhod. <i>Argon.</i> 3.1207	3rd century BC
βόθροι	The dead	<i>CAF</i> , vol. 3, Adespota, fr. 128 (Kock 1888)	3rd century BC?
βόθρος	The dead	Lucian <i>De astr.</i> 24	1st century AD
βόθρος	The dead	Lucian <i>Charon</i> 22	1st century AD
βόθρος	The gods of the underworld	Lucian <i>Menip.</i> 9	1st century AD
βόθρος	A dead father, Hekate	Lucian <i>Philops.</i> 14	1st century AD
βόθροι	The winds	Paus. 2.12.1	2nd century AD
βόθρος	Kore	Paus. 2.22.3	2nd century AD
βόθρος	Pelops	Paus. 5.13.2	2nd century AD
βόθρος	Agamedes	Paus. 9.37.7	2nd century AD
βόθρος	Agamedes	Paus. 9.39.6	2nd century AD
βόθρος	The dead	Paus. 10.29.8	2nd century AD
βόθροι	Any "necessary" gods	Ael. Arist. <i>Hier. log.</i> II 27	2nd century AD
βόθρος	Hypochthonian gods	Porph. <i>De antr. nymph.</i> 6	3rd century AD
βόθρος	<i>Nerterioi theoi</i>	Porph. <i>De phil.</i> 114	3rd century AD
βόθροι	Hypochthonian gods	Porph. <i>De phil.</i> 118	3rd century AD
βόθρος	The dead	Philostr. <i>VA</i> 4.16	3rd century AD
βόθρος	Chthonian gods	Philostr. <i>VA</i> 6.11	3rd century AD
βόθροι	Chthonian gods(?)	Philostr. <i>VA</i> 8.7.9	3rd century AD
βόθροι	The dead	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 43.14	3rd century AD
βόθροι	Achilles	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 53.11	3rd century AD
βόθρος	The heroes at the Academy	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 1.17.5	3rd century AD
βόθρος	The dead	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 6.14.3–6	3rd century AD
βόθρος	The dead Kyzikos	<i>Orph. Argon.</i> 572	4th century AD
βόθρος	Hekate, Pandora and Poinai	<i>Orph. Argon.</i> 951, 954, 964, 970 and 981	4th century AD

Only cases in which the term is used in a religious context have been included.

Obvious similarities to Homer are to be found in the *Argonautica* of Apollonios Rhodios, describing how Jason must act to take the Golden Fleece.

The story even echoes the narrative structure of Homer. First, Medea tells Jason in detail how to proceed and then follows the description of what is done, i.e., more or less the same account given twice, just as in the case of Kirke and Odysseus. In the middle of the night, in a

far-away place, Jason is to bathe in a stream, dig a round *bothros* one cubit deep, cut the throat of a ewe over it, pile up firewood and sacrifice the animal whole, by placing the body on top of the pyre and setting fire to it. Finally, he is to evoke Hekate and pour out libations of milk and honey. The sacrifice aims at contacting Hekate and, when that has been accomplished, Jason is to leave without turning back.

87

The ritual outlined in the *Argonautica* is echoed in the *Orphic Argonautica*, which is largely dependent on Apollonios Rhodios but is hardly earlier than the 4th century AD.

184

Here Mopsos instructs the Argonauts how, by evoking Hekate, they are to get into the precinct where the dragon guards the Golden Fleece. Orpheus digs a triangular *bothros* (or a *bothros* with three compartments), fills it with various kinds of dry wood and places figures made of meal on top of the heap. The sacrificial animals consist of three black puppies. Their blood is mixed with various herbs and poured into their stomachs, which are placed on top of the wood. The rest of the intestines are scattered around the *bothros*. Orpheus sounds a bronze gong and prays. Finally, Hekate, Pandora and the Poinai appear, carrying torches, and the wood in the *bothros* kindles by itself.

88

The recipients of the sacrifices in the *bothroi* considered so far were the gods of the underworld, as well as the dead. In fact, in almost all the cases in which a *bothros* is used for sacrifices, the recipients have a connection with death and the underworld, either as gods associated with that sphere, as heroes or as ordinary dead. Among the divinities named are Hekate and Kore, and among the unnamed, the *hypochthonioi* and *chthonioitheoi*, as well as any god to whom it is necessary to sacrifice in order to avoid immediate death.

185

The heroes found in these contexts are Pelops, Agamedes, Achilles and the Athenian heroes in the garden of Akademos.

186

Finally, the departed are approached by sacrifices in a *bothros*, both as a part of the regular cult of the dead and in trying to get into contact with the dead, either to be able to talk to their souls or to bring them back to life.

The only exception in which the recipient is not connected with death is the use of *bothroi* to tame the winds at Titane, reported by Pausanias.

89

The main aim of using a *bothros* was to get into contact with those residing below ground. This ritual formed part of the regular funerary cult, according to Lucian, who has Charon express his surprise that the living actually thought that the dead could come up from below and eat of the meals burnt on the pyres and drink of the wine and the *melikraton* poured into the *bothroi*.

90

More significant is the use of the *bothros* in magic rituals for direct contact with a particular dead person. In Lucian, for example, a young man has a magician dig a *bothros* and perform rites to summon his dead father and to make it possible for the son to hear his father's opinion of his girl-friend.

In the *Aethiopica* of Heliodoros, a mother performs an elaborate ritual at a *bothros* on the battlefield at night, to bring her fallen son back from the dead, so that she can inquire about the fate of her other son.

By digging the *bothros* and sacrificing into it, a dead person or the divinity could be summoned and called up to the world of the living.

91

The divinities of the underworld could also be evoked or called by the use of a *bothros*. Hekate, either alone or in the company of other deities of her kind, is summoned both by Jason, by the young man trying to contact his dead father and by Orpheus.

Heroes were also called in this manner: Agamedes was called by those consulting the oracle of Trophonios, when a ram was sacrificed in the *bothros* located on the site where the earth swallowed up Trophonios.

Achilles and Patroklos are invited to come and participate in a *dais* on the burial mound of Achilles at Troy, where a bull is slaughtered at the newly dug *bothroi*.

The sacrifice in a *bothros* performed by Herakles to Pelops at Olympia should perhaps also be taken to contain an element of calling and inviting Pelops to come and participate.

195

92

The second use of the *bothroi*, which partly overlaps the first, was to perform a sacrifice to solve a difficult situation and, in particular, to avoid danger. Both Jason and Orpheus sacrifice in the *bothros* in order to succeed in retrieving the Golden Fleece.

196

These sacrifices are aimed not only at contacting Hekate, but also at propitiating her. In Aelius Aristides, this aim is even clearer.

197

Asklepios tells the author that he will die in two days, unless he seeks out a deserted location outside the city, digs a *bothros* and performs a sacrifice to whichever god it is thought to be necessary. Back in the city again, he is to perform a regular *thysia* sacrifice, followed by dining, to Asklepios, as well as to cut off a part of his body, which, fortunately, could be substituted by the dedication of a ring. Similarly, from Philostratos we learn that it was thought that pestilence could be averted by digging *bothroi*, even though Philostratos himself mocks this belief.

198

At Titane, the winds could be tamed by sacred rites in four *bothroi*, as well as by the singing of the charms of Medea.

199

93

The rituals performed are of two kinds, those taking place in the *bothros* and those executed outside it. The first kind consisted mainly of libations. Honey, water, milk and wine could be poured in, either separately or mixed together.

200

In the cases in which there was an animal sacrifice the blood was poured out, usually in the pit itself directly from the slit throat of the animal, but in one instance, the blood was sprinkled around the pit.

201

Heliodoros mentions an *enagizein* sacrifice to the heroes in the *bothros* in the garden of Akademos, which should probably be taken to refer to an animal sacrifice, in which the meat was completely destroyed. The blood may have been separately poured out into the *bothros*.

Pausanias speaks of two sacrifices into a *bothros*, using the term *thyein*. The first case concerns the sacrifices performed by Herakles to Pelops, a cult which seems to have consisted of a blood libation followed by ritual dining.

The second passage describes the preparations before consulting the oracle of Trophonios, which included the sacrifice (*thyein*) of a ram into a *bothros*. Presumably, the blood was poured into the pit, while the meat was eaten.

In Aelius Aristides, the expression for the sacrifice is δρᾶσαι τὰ ἱερά,, which must refer to an animal sacrifice but since the *bothros* was to be dug explicitly for this occasion, it is likely that the blood went into it.

Non-liquid offerings, such as cakes shaped like a man (*pemmata* or *ouloplasmata*), could occasionally be thrown into the *bothros*, but the sources mentioning this practice are both late.

Finally, Pausanias states that in the sanctuary of Demeter at Argos, burning torches were thrown into the *bothros* in honour of Kore.

This ritual seems to be completely different from the libations and animal sacrifices outlined so far and should, however, perhaps be connected with the use of pits, usually called *megara*, and torches in the cult of Demeter and Kore.

The rituals taking place outside the *bothros* consisted mainly of burning. The ewe slaughtered by Jason in the *Argonautica* was to be placed on the pyre heaped up on the edge of the *bothros* and sacrificed whole, ἀδαίετον ὠμοθετῆσαι, i.e., completely burnt.

At the *enagizein* sacrifices to the heroes in the garden of Akademos and to Achilles at Troy, the location of the burning is not specified, but it is likely to have taken place outside the *bothros*.

The burning of meals at the tombs of ordinary deceased persons definitely took place on the ground, in front of the burial mounds and

near the dug-out *bothroi*.

211

The only cases of anything being burnt inside the *bothros* are found in the late *Orphic Argonautica*, where the wood is placed in the pit, together with the animal victims, and subsequently burnt. What happens to the blood in these cases is not entirely clear. At the burial of Kyzikos, the victims are called *entoma*, which may indicate that the victims were bled before they were burnt.

212

In the sacrifice to Hekate, the blood was poured into the stomachs of the puppies, which were subsequently placed on the wood in the *bothros* and burnt.

213

95

Looking at the location and appearance of the *bothroi*, it is clear that the majority were single installations created for the particular occasion. A need had arisen to contact the dead or the divinities of the underworld or to make a sacrifice aiming at solving particular problems, such as the threat of disease or death, and consequently the *bothros* was dug. In some cases, it is emphasized that the *bothroi* are to be located outside the bounds of society in a deserted spot.

214

Other *bothroi* were dug at graves or in the actual burial mound.

215

One *bothros* is found in a private garden.

216

These *bothroi* were not meant to be part of a general and official cult. As far as it is possible to tell, they seem to have been fairly small and shallow. The pit dug by Jason was one cubit deep (cf. the pit dug by Odysseus, which was one cubit long). The fact that the *bothros* is often dug by one person, in one case even by an old woman, also gives the impression of it being a fairly small hole.

217

There is no indication of these *bothroi* being adorned or elaborated; they were just simple holes in the ground.

96

The *bothroi* located in sanctuaries, on the other hand, seem to have been both of a more permanent character and of larger size. Sacrifices were regularly performed in these *bothroi*: to the winds at Titane, to Kore at Argos, to Agamedes at Lebadeia and to the heroes

in the garden of Akademos at Athens.

218

The sacrifices to Achilles at Troy took place on his burial mound, but they were a recurrent event and his grave functioned as the sanctuary of the hero.

219

The *bothros* sacrifice performed by Herakles to Pelops at Olympia may have been a single occasion in connection with the institution of the cult, but it is possible that a similar sacrifice also formed part of the ongoing rituals at the Pelopion.

220

The sizes of some of these *bothroi* must have been substantial. A woman committed suicide by flinging herself into the *bothros* of the heroes at the garden of Akademos, and the *bothros* at Lebadeia was identified as the hole into which Trophonios disappeared.

221

97

To sum up the use of *bothroi* in the post-300 BC sources, it seems possible to divide them into two categories. On the one hand, there are the *bothroi* dug for the individual occasion, located outside any kind of sanctuary and often set apart from society and the neighbourhood of the living. The sacrifices consist either of libations (milk, honey, wine, water) or of blood, if an animal sacrifice takes place. The animal victim was subsequently destroyed and there is no sign of dining taking place at these sacrifices. The aim of the ritual is to deal with a particular situation. The recipients of the sacrifices are either the divinities of the underworld or the dead.

98

On the other hand, there are the more institutionalized *bothroi*, which were permanent installations, used for recurrent rituals and located in sanctuaries. The recipients of these cults are more diverse: the winds, Kore, Agamedes, the heroes at the Academy, Pelops and Achilles at Troy. In the case of the sacrifices to the winds, no details are known and the throwing of torches into the *bothros* of Kore seems to belong to a category of rituals different from the other sacrifices for which *bothroi* were used.

99

The rituals of the heroes, however, have certain traits in common with the rituals used at the temporary *bothroi*, but they also show

some deviating features. The *enagizein* sacrifice to the heroes in the garden of Akademos is best understood as an animal sacrifice, including the complete destruction of the victim, perhaps preceded by pouring the blood into the *bothros*.

222

This ritual is similar to the *bothros* sacrifice in Apollonios Rhodios, but it is an institutionalized cult performed by the polemarch. The sacrifices to Achilles at Troy comprised the slaughter (*sphattein*) of a bull into *bothroi* dug in the burial mound, the calling of Achilles and Patroklos to come and participate in the *dais* and the annihilation of the victim (*enagizein*).

223

The ritual was then continued with a regular *thysia* sacrifice on the beach using a second victim. The Thessalians took the carcass with them when they left, and the reason given for not consuming the meat on the spot was that they did not want to dine on enemy territory. The first part of the ritual involving the institutionalized *bothroi* is the same as the rituals at the temporary *bothroi*, but it is complemented by a *thysia* probably involving dining.

100

The last two cases of hero-cults at *bothroi* seem to have consisted of a blood libation, followed by ritual dining. The blood of a ram sacrificed to Agamedes (*thyein*) at Lebadeia must have been poured into the *bothros* while Agamedes was called upon.

224

The meat from this victim, just like the rest of the victims sacrificed at the consultation of Trophonios at Lebadeia, was likely to have been eaten. Finally, the *thyein* sacrifice to Pelops at Olympia, which was performed by Herakles at a *bothros*, included dining on the meat by the worshippers, at least in Pausanias' time, and it also seems likely that Pelops was called upon to come and participate.

225

2.2.3. *Bothros* in the explicatory sources

101

There is a handful of mentions of *bothros* in the explicatory sources as well, but not much additional information is provided. Two cases are connected with Homer's *Nekyia* and explain the *bothros* as being used for the blood of the victims sacrificed (*thyein*) to the departed.

Similar information is given by Hesychios, who explains *kotyliskos* as, among other things, the *bothros* into which the blood of the sacrificed victims is discarded.

102

In a scholion to Euripides' *Phoenician Maidens*, discussed earlier in connection with *eschara*, it is stated that *eschara* is mainly the *bothros* in the ground where they sacrifice (*enagizein*) to those going down (τοῖς κάτω ἐρχομένοις), i.e., to the departed.

The use of a *bothros* for sacrifices to the dead is well documented in a number of sources, as we have seen above. This scholion is the only source connecting *bothros* directly with *eschara*. The explanation of *eschara* as meaning a *bothros* for the dead is probably due to *eschara* here being understood as something hollow, since the same scholion also explains *bomioi escharai* as the depressions of the *bomoi*

Table 8. Instances of *bothros* in the explicatory literary sources.

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
βόθρος	–	Hsch. s.v. κοτυλίσκος (Latte 1953–66, K 3818)	5th century AD
βόθρος	The dead	East. <i>Or.</i> 10.517 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 393)	12th century AD
βόθρος	Those going down	Schol. ad Eur. <i>Phoen.</i> 274 (Schwartz 1887)	–
βόθρος	The dead	Schol. ad Hom. <i>Or.</i> 10.517 (Dindorf 1855)	–

Only cases in which the term is used in a religious context have been included.

2.3. Conclusion

103

The chronological spread of the term *bothros* is uneven. Apart from the use of the term in Homer, *bothros* occurs in a handful of Hellenistic sources, but the most frequent usage dates to the Roman period. The great majority of the recipients of the sacrifices performed in *bothroi* show a connection with the underworld, either as deities linked to the realm of the dead, as heroes or as ordinary departed. A direct link between the term and heroes cannot be

established before the Roman period. In all, the use of *bothroi* at sacrifices to heroes is slight and this kind of sacrificial installation was never a regular feature of hero-cults.

104

Most of the *bothroi* (no matter the recipient or the chronological context) seem to have been temporary installations used for a single occasion. They were dug for the specific purpose of getting into contact with the beings of the underworld, to propitiate them, to seek their aid and to avoid danger and diseases. The marginality of these sacrifices is clearly demonstrated by the location of these pits in remote areas outside the bounds of society or at cemeteries, and by the private or secret character of the rituals, performed by only one or a few participants and not followed by any collective dining.

105

It is interesting to note that the main characteristics of these *bothros* sacrifices are all found in the *Nekyia* of Homer and it is clear that there is a connection between this account and many of the ritual uses of *bothroi* found in the later sources. In some cases, particularly when the *bothros* is used in a mythical context, it can be argued that the later sources simply copied the ritual of the *Nekyia*. It is possible that the whole concept of *bothros* is to be considered as deriving from Homer, even though he must presumably have referred to a ritual or an action which was comprehensible to his audience.

230

Homer's use of the term *bothros* is, however, rather due to his description of a ritual making use of a dug-out pit than *bothros* being an established sacrificial installation already in this period.

231

The impact of Homer may, in its turn, have led to the creating of a sacrificial installation designated by this term. The sacrifice of blood into a *bothros*, in order to contact the dead and the beings of the underworld, seems to have become more or less a *topos*, and most contexts in which the term is used in this sense are purely literary and cannot be regarded as descriptions of rituals actually performed. However, the epigraphically attested, 2nd-century AD oracle given by Apollon at Klaros outlining a similar ritual, paralleled in the writings of Porphyrios, seems to reflect a well-known and specific use of *bothros* for actual ritual purposes in the Roman period.

232

The *bothroi* used in hero-cults show a different pattern. They were recurrently used, forming a regular part of the cult and directly connected with a specific location where the hero was worshipped. Furthermore, the rituals were not private or secret, but involved a larger number of participants, since they were more or less public. The *bothros* seems to have been used for a blood ritual, aiming at contacting and calling upon the hero to come and participate in the subsequent rituals, which, at least in some cases, included ritual dining for the worshippers. The use of *bothroi* in herocults cannot be said to be a dominant feature, since it can be documented in so few cases and only in late sources. The reason for using the *bothros* may be connected with the fact that the hero was dead and there was a will to contact him. It is possible that *bothroi*, in Greek cult in general, were primarily and originally used for occasional sacrifices answering particular needs and called for by the situation, as outlined previously. This use was transferred to the hero-cults, but in these cults the *bothroi* became institutionalized and were used for only one part of a larger ritual.

3. Enagizein, enagisma, enagismos and enagisterion

The last group of terms, which will be analysed in this chapter, is *enagizein* and the nouns *enagisma*, *enagismos* and *enagisterion*. The *LSJ* explains *enagizein* as “to offer sacrifices to the dead, opposed to θύω”. The meaning of *enagisma* is given as “offering to the dead” and of *enagismos* as “offering to the dead” or “sacrifice”. *Enagisterion* is explained as “a place for offerings to the dead”.

The general tendency in modern scholarship has been to regard *enagizein* and its associated nouns as particularly connected with sacrifices to the dead and the heroes.

The terms have also been linked to other terms, such as *eschara*, *bothros*, *entemnein*, *haimakouria* and *choai*, which have all been considered to express the specific ritual actions of these cults.

Enagizein has been understood as being the opposite to *thyein*, the former term indicating that the recipient was a hero or a dead person, while the latter was used only for sacrifices to the gods.

Casabona's detailed study of the sacrificial terminology has shown, however, that the relation between *enagizein* and *thyein* is that of a technical term versus a very general term. *Thyein* could be used for sacrifices to the gods above, as well as to the heroes and deified mortals. Only when the two terms are used in opposition, does *thyein* take on the meaning of "to sacrifice to an immortal or an Olympian god", while *enagizein* refers to a technical term for the funerary honours given to the dead.

On the general level, the meaning of *enagizein* has been understood as *tabu facere*, to render sacred or to place in the domain of the sacred, i.e., to remove from the sphere of the living.

Concerning the rituals covered by the terms, two main explanations have been advanced. On the one hand, *enagizein* has been considered to refer to a total destruction of the victims or offerings by burning them in a holocaust.

In this sense, an *enagizein* sacrifice would imply that no part of the animal would be available for consumption by the worshippers. On the other hand, the terms have been linked to various kinds of libations, such as wine, *melikraton*, milk and, in particular, blood.

It has also been suggested that *enagizein* and the related nouns can refer to both kinds of actions, i.e., the discarding of the blood of the animal followed by the burning of the carcass

3.1. Epigraphical sources

None of the three terms *enagizein*, *enagismos* and *enagisterion* is documented in the epigraphical record before the 2nd century BC. When they are found, *enagizein* and *enagisterion* are used only in

connection with heroes, while the term *enagismos* is found for sacrifices both to heroes and to the dead. The term *enagisma*, which, in the literary sources, occurs from Aristophanes onwards, is not documented in the inscriptions.

241

In all, the number of instances in which the three terms are used in the epigraphical record is low (see Table 9, p. 81).

3.1.1. Enagizein and enagismos

111

The earliest occurrence of the verb *enagizein* is found in a substantial ephebic inscription dating to 123/2 BC, discussed above in connection with the *eschara* of Dionysos.

242

Among the deeds performed by the ephebes and for which they were praised was that they marched to the *polyandreion* at Marathon, placed wreaths on it and ἐνήγισαν to those who had died in the war for freedom : ἤγαγεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ [ἐ]μ Μ[αρ]αθῶνι πόλυάνδρ[ειον καὶ ἐστεφ] άνωσαν καὶ ἐνήγ[ισ]αν τοῖς κατὰ πόλεμον τελευτήσασιν ὑπ[ὲρ] τῆς ἐλευτηρίας (line 69).

243

In the same inscription are also mentioned sacrifices to other heroes. Amphiaraios received sacrifices at the Amphiareion (lines 27–28 and 70–71) and Aias on Salamis (lines 30–31 and 72–73), but the term used for these sacrifices is *thyein*. Presumably, there must have been a difference between the sacrifices to the Marathonian war dead, compared with those to Amphiaraios and Aias, which prompted the use of different terms.

112

The sacrifices to Amphiaraios and Aias, on the one hand, and to the Marathon war dead, on the other, differ both as to their chronological contexts and as to their contents. Amphiaraios and Aias were well-established heroes, who had been worshipped by the Athenians at least from the 5th century BC onwards.

244

The sacrifices to Amphiaraios mentioned in the inscription took place at the Amphiareion, a sanctuary with a recurrent festival to the hero, at which the sacrifices were followed by ritual dining.

245

In the case of Aias, the sacrifices formed part of the *Aianteia*, a festival which also included a procession, a gymnastic competition, a torch-race and a boat-race.

246

Here, too, it is reasonable to assume that dining formed a part of the ritual activity.

113

The history of the cult of the war dead at Marathon is more tricky. The first source which states that they received a cult is in fact *IG II*² 1006, followed by Pausanias (1.32.4), who says that they were honoured (*sebontai*). Most modern scholars consider them as heroes but waver as to whether these war dead had a continuous cult from the 5th century onwards.

247

It is possible that this was the case, even if our sources do not say so.

248

But it is also possible that the cult, or at least the *enagizein* sacrifice, was a late-2nd-century BC feature.

114

The sacrifice to the Marathonian war dead was performed by the ephebes, a fact that may be relevant to the understanding of the ritual.

115

After having petered out in the late 3rd century, the ephebic institution was resurrected after 166 BC and transformed from a regular military institution into an exclusive education for boys from the upper class, both Athenians and foreigners.

249

Participation in various religious activities was fundamental for these ephebes. Athens was no longer a free city with its own foreign policy but dependent on the Romans, and the emphasis on religious rites connected with a glorious past is clear in the inscriptions documenting the yearly activities of the revived ephebeia.

250

Seen in this light, it is possible that the *enagizein* sacrifice to the war dead at Marathon may have been a particular, 2nd-century BC ritual, regarded as being specifically suitable for the ephebes, since the ephebeia had an originally military background and since this sacrifice also evoked the honourable history of Athens. The *enagizein*

sacrifice is mentioned only in IG II² 1006, which is one of the earliest ephebic inscriptions, while other religious actions are found in several inscriptions. The sacrifice to the Marathon war dead was perhaps an occasional event and did not mark the institution of a regular sacrifice or the continuation of an earlier cult.

116

The *enagizein* sacrifice took place at the tomb of the fallen warriors at Marathon, which was decorated with wreaths, an action usually found in the cult of the dead. The focus on the tomb, the placing of wreaths and the use of the term *enagizein* indicate that this sacrifice was of a kind different from the *thysia* sacrifices to Amphiaraos and Aias. The ritual may have consisted in a single visit to the tomb, at which sacrifices, either of animals or of other kinds of offerings, were performed. It is possible that this sacrifice, taking place on the actual battlefield, should be regarded as a new invention of the 2nd century BC and as being a distinct ritual separate from the regular cult of the war dead, which took place at the Kerameikos.

117

The second inscription in which *enagizein* is used also concerns sacrifices to the war dead from the Persian wars, but in Megara.

251

The text consists of an early-5th-century BC epigram attributed to Simonides, inscribed by the high-priest Helladios in the 4th century AD at the earliest, but possibly even later.

252

The epigram honours the Megarians who fell at Plataiai. It is preceded by Helladios' introduction, in which the war dead are called heroes, and ends with the addition [Μ]εχρὶς ἐφ' ἡμῶν δὲ ἡ πόλις [κ]α[ὶ] ταῦρον ἐν[ή] γ [ι] ζεν (IG VII 53, 13). The text is quite damaged and the exact reading of the last word is difficult.

253

The content is clear, however, even though the tense depends on how the last word is read: "Down to our time the city also sacrificed a bull" (Lattimore), "Up to our own day the city has consecrated a bull" (Campbell) or "The city consecrates a bull up to our time" (Page). What is of major interest is the fact that the term *enagizein* is found only in the 4th-century AD addition to the text. In the 4th century AD, the Megarian war dead received an *enagizein* sacrifice consisting of a bull, but it is questionable whether this was an early practice. Very

little is known of the Megarian war dead, and it is not even certain where they were buried and where the sacrifice could have taken place. According to Herodotos, they were buried on the battlefield (9.85), while Pausanias claims that their tombs were in the city (1.43.3). In the introduction to the epigram, Helladios says that the heroes are resting where the inscription was located and, since the stone was found in Megara, presumably the tomb was considered to be located there in the 4th century AD.

118

The last line of the inscription states that the bull sacrifice was performed even in Helladios' own time, which seems to indicate a long tradition. This, however, may partly be wishful thinking on Helladios' part. Wade-Gery emphasized that Helladios inscribed, not *re-inscribed*, the epigram and that the text seems to have been copied from a literary source rather than from another inscription.

254

Thus, Helladios seems to have either revived a cult that had fallen into oblivion (the text says that the epigram had been destroyed by time) or instituted a new cult. In any case, the *enagizein* sacrifice was not part of a continuous, ancient tradition and may have been a feature added by Helladios himself in connection with the execution of the inscription. Perhaps the tomb of the fallen soldiers was restored on the same occasion.

119

The term *enagismos* is found in five inscriptions, but only two of these seem to refer to heroes. The first is from Pergamon and dates to the 1st century BC.

255

The inscription honours the Pergamene Diodoros Paspáros, a great benefactor of his city, for what he has accomplished as gymnasiarch.

256

120

Diodoros took a great interest in various cults in his city and among his deeds was the execution of an *enagismos* to Aristonidas, an otherwise unknown, Pergamene hero. The inscription is partly damaged, and it is not clear whether Diodoros inaugurated the worship of Aristonidas or just promoted its continuation.

121

Another hero receiving an *enagismos* was Aristomenes at Messene. A

substantial decree dating to the Augustan period, placed on the northern side of the agora at Messene, lists the citizens who donated money for the preservation and repair of buildings in that city.

257

Kraton, son of Archedamos, granted wood to the gymnasium for 300 denars and promised an additional 70 denars for the *enagismos* of a bull Aristomenes εἰς ἐναγισμόν Ἀριστομένει ταύρου δεινάρια ἑβδομήκοντα (lines 12–14). Aristomenes was the main hero of Messene and his exploits are described in detail by Pausanias (4.14.7–4.22.7), who also states that Aristomenes was buried at the gymnasium, after his bones had been sent to Messene from Rhodes (4.32.3). The cult of Aristomenes, as described by Pausanias, follows the same outline as the inscription: an *enagizein* sacrifice of a bull. Pausanias adds further that the bull was tied to a pillar on the hero's grave before being sacrificed (4.32.3). Presumably the sacrifice to Aristomenes mentioned in the inscription also took place at the hero's tomb at the gymnasium, since the donation of funds by Kraton concerned both the gymnasium and the cult of Aristomenes.

122

The remaining three cases of *enagismos* all cover funerary sacrifices to private individuals, and there is no reason to regard the recipients as being heroes of the same kind as those considered so far. On an inscribed sarcophagus from Byzantion, dated to around 100 BC, it is stated that the judge Iatrokles Ainetos from Mylasa was given a burial and an *enagismos* by the people of Byzantion, where he died.

258

A similar wording, burial and *enagismos*, is found in an inscription from Lampsakos dating from the 1st to the 2nd century AD.

259

The last inscription containing the term *enagismos* is a foundation decree from Hypaipa near Ephesos dated to AD 301.

260

One part of the foundation deals with the reservation of financial means for an *enagismos* to the son of the donor, if he was buried in the family *heroon*. The *enagismoι* in these three cases seem to have been single sacrifices performed in connection with the burial, and there is no indication of a continuation of the ritual.

3.1.2. Enagisterion

The term *enagisterion* is found only once in the epigraphical evidence and never in the literary sources. The term occurs in an inscription dating to about AD 170, dealing with work performed by Licinius Priscus Juventianus in the sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia, which had been damaged in an earthquake c. AD 150–175. Juventianus was a wealthy Roman who spent lavishly at Isthmia. Among the buildings which he restored or had constructed were the Palaimonion with its ornaments, the *enagisterion* and the sacred portal : τὸ Παλαιμόνιον σὺν τοῖς προσκοσμήμασιν καὶ τὸ ἐναγιστήριον καὶ τὴν ἱεράν ἐίσοδον (lines 8–10).

261

The buildings mentioned in the inscription have been identified in the excavations of the site.

262

The shrine of Palaimon, located just to the south-east of the temple of Poseidon, shows three major phases. The first phase dates to c. AD 50–80, the second to c. AD 80–100 and the final phase to c. 150, to the late 2nd or possibly early 3rd century AD.

263

The third phase, recovered in the excavations, corresponds well to the buildings mentioned in the inscription. At that time, the shrine consisted of two main parts: a small tholos on a podium and a stone-lined pit, both placed within courtyards, and an elaborate entrance to the stoa to the north. In the pit were found ashes and burnt bones, mainly from bovines and young bulls that had been burnt whole in the fire.

264

The stones forming the walls of the pit had been badly damaged by fire.

124

The term *enagisterion* must be derived from *enagizein* and refer to the pit where holocausts of the bulls were performed, as well as to the courtyard in which the pit was located.

265

Furthermore, in the description of the “Palaimon” painting, Philostratos states that Sisyphos is sacrificing (*thyei*) a black bull and that the rituals also included *enagismata*.

266

Even if the *enagisterion* is mentioned only in the Juventianus

inscription and refers to the third phase of the Palaimonion, the two previous courtyards with their sacrificial pits are likely to have been called by the same term.

125

It is important to remember that all the archaeological, epigraphical and literary evidence for holocaustic sacrifices of bulls to Palaimon at Isthmia dates to the Roman period. The whole sanctuary of Poseidon seems to have been more or less deserted from the mid 2nd century BC to the third quarter of the 1st century AD.

267

There might have been an earlier cult of Palaimon at Isthmia, but nothing is known of how or where it was performed.

268

It is thus possible that the *enagizein* sacrifices to Palaimon at Isthmia were instituted at the Roman revival of the sanctuary.

269

Table 9. Instances of *enagizein*, *enagisterion* and *enagismos* in the epigraphical sources.

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίζεον	War dead at Marathon	<i>IG</i> II ² 1006, 26 and 69	123/2 BC
ἐναγίζεον	War dead in Persian wars, Megara	<i>IG</i> VII 53, 13 = Kaibel 1878, no. 461, 11	4th–5th century AD
ἐναγιστήριον	Palaimon, hero at Isthmia	<i>IG</i> IV 203, 9 = Gegan 1989, 350, line 9	c. AD 170
ἐναγισμός	Private person, Iatrokles Aineos from Mylasa	Mansel 1957, 407–408, no. 4	c. 100 BC
ἐναγισμός	Aristonidas, hero at Pergamon	<i>OGIS</i> , no. 764, 16 = <i>KGR</i> IV 294, 16	69 BC
ἐναγισμός	Aristomenes, hero at Messene	Orlandos 1959, 170, line 13	Augustan
ἐναγισμός	Private person, Apollonios from Lampsakos	Frisch 1978, no. 23 = <i>CIG</i> 3645	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγισμός	Private person from Hypaipa	Drew-Bear 1960, 534, line 2 = Merig et al. 1981, no. 3803b	AD 201

126

To sum up, the terms *enagizein*, *enagismos* and *enagisterion* are not documented in the epigraphical evidence in connection with heroes before the late 2nd century BC, and, taken as a whole, the terms are mainly used in the Roman period (Table 9). Judging from the available evidence, the sacrifices were focused on the tombs of the war dead at Marathon and from Megara, as well as of Aristomenes at Messene. The connection with the graves is also emphasized by the fact that

enagismos is used for a sacrifice at the burial of the ordinary dead. The war dead at Marathon and from Megara and Aristomenes died violent deaths, being killed in battle, while Palaimon was drowned. Furthermore, the terms seem to have been particularly favoured when hero-sacrifices were instituted or restored, which seems to have been the case with the Marathon and Megarian war dead, Palaimon and perhaps also for Aristomenes at Messene and Aristonidas at Pergamon.

3.2. Literary sources

3.2.1. *Enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the Archaic to early Hellenistic sources

127

In the literary sources dating to before 300 BC, *enagizein* and *enagismata* are used for sacrifices to heroes (Table 10), and *enagizein*, *enagismata* and *enagismoi* for sacrifices to deceased persons (Table 11, p. 87).

270

Table 10. Instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the Archaic to early Hellenistic literary sources. Greek contexts: Heroes Term *Enagizein* Recipient Source

Greek contexts: Heroes			
Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίζειν	Killed Phokians	Hdt. 1.167	5th century BC
ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρωα	Herakles	Hdt. 2.44	5th century BC
ἐναγίζειν	Atreidai, Tydeidai, Aiakidai and Laertiadai	<i>Mir. ausc.</i> 840a	4th century BC
ἐναγισμοῖς	Harmodios and Aristogeiton	<i>Ath. pol.</i> 58.1	4th century BC

128

The earliest literary source in which *enagizein* is found is Herodotos, who uses the term in two different passages.

271

The first case concerns sacrifices performed to a number of Greek prisoners of war from Phokaia who had been killed by stoning by the Etruscans of Agylla (Hdt. 1.167). After this summary execution had taken place, the location where the stoned Phokaians lay proved to be

a dangerous spot: any man or animal from Agylla passing it became distorted, crippled and paralysed. The Agyllans consulted Delphi about remedying their wrongdoing, and the Pythia ordered them to do what they still did in Herodotos' time, namely to sacrifice greatly to the dead Phokaians and to set up athletic games and horse-races (ἡ δέ Πυθίη) οφείας ἐνέλευσε ποιέειν τὰ καὶ νῦν οἱ Ἀγυλλαῖοι ἔτι ἐπιτελέουσι καὶ γὰρ ἐναγίζουσί σφι μέγας καὶ ἀγῶνα γυμνικὸν καὶ ἵππικὸν ἐπιστᾶσι).

129

The contents of these *enagizein* sacrifices are likely to have been substantial, since they are performed μέγας (greatly) and were accompanied by athletic contests and horse-races. Exactly what was sacrificed is not known, but a ritual on that scale presumably included some animal sacrifice. The ritual was probably focused on the place where the Phokaians had died and were buried. The reason for the institution of the cult should also be noted: to avoid a dangerous situation, arising from a violent and unjust killing, and to propitiate the anger of the recipients of the sacrifices. Even though the setting itself is non-Greek, the ritual was prescribed by Delphi, i.e., it had a Greek origin and followed a Greek pattern: sacrifice, games and horse-races.

272

130

The second passage of interest here is found in the Aristotelian *Athenaionpoliteia* (58.1), where the religious duties of the polemarch are discussed.

Ὁ δέ πολέμαρχος θύει μὲν θυσίας τήν τε τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ ἀγροτέρᾳ καὶ τῷ Ἐνυαλίῳ, διατ[ί]θησι. δ' ἀγῶνα τὸν ἐπιτάφιον {καὶ} τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ Ἀρμοδίῳ καὶ Ἀριστογείτονι ἐναγίσματα ποιεῖ.

273

The polemarch performs the sacrifices to Artemis Agrotera and to Enyalios and arranges the funeral games in honour of those who have fallen in the war and performs enagismata to Harmodios and Aristogeiton.

131

The relation between these three religious activities is somewhat complicated, since it is not directly clear over how many festivals they were spread. The *thysia* sacrifices to Artemis Agrotera and

Enyalios to commemorate the victory at Marathon were presumably performed at a separate festival on the 6th of Boedromion.

274

The funeral games to the war dead and the *enagismata* to Harmodios and Aristogeiton are more difficult to sort out.

275

The text states that the polemarch διατίθησι δ' ἄγωνα τὸν ἐπιτάφιον {καὶ} τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ Ἀρμοδίῳ καὶ Ἀριστογείτονι ἐναγίσματα ποιεῖ . The interpretation depends on whether the *kai* before *tois teteleutekosin* should be deleted, emended or retained.

276

132

It is beyond dispute that funeral games were organized for those who had fallen in the war. The question is, whether these war dead received funeral games separately from the *enagismata* to Harmodios and Aristogeiton or whether both the war dead and Harmodios and Aristogeiton were the recipients of funeral games as well as *enagismata*. Any certainty seems impossible, but, in any case, the cult of Harmodios and Aristogeiton must have been close to the cult of the Athenian war dead: both fell under the responsibilities of the polemarch, both were located at the Demosion Sema and the Academy region, and both had a connection with warfare.

277

It is possible that Harmodios and Aristogeiton regularly received funeral games, even though these seem to have been intimately linked mainly to the funeral of the war dead but also to their subsequent cult.

278

However, it is clear that Harmodios and Aristogeiton were given *enagismata*, but it is questionable whether this was the kind of sacrifice normally used in the cult of the war dead in this period. Other contemporary sources that mention the sacrifices to the war dead speak of *thysiai*, never *enagismata*.

279

It is probably best to regard the *enagismata* sacrifices to Harmodios and Aristogeiton as being distinct from the commemorations of the war dead, on a concrete, executorial level.

133

The passages from Herodotos and the *Athenaion politeia* do not offer any direct explanation of the contents of the rituals covered by *enagizein* and *enagismata*. On this particular point, the sacrifices to various groups of heroes at Taras mentioned in the Ps.-Aristotelian *On marvellous things heard*, are of great interest.

280

Ἐν τάραντι ἐναγίζειν κατὰ τινας χρόνους φασὶν Ἀτρεΐδαις καὶ Τυδεΐδαις καὶ Αἰανίδαις καὶ Λαερτιάδαις, καὶ Ἀγαμεμνονίδαις δὲ χωρὶς θυσίαν ἐπιτελεῖν ἐν ἄλλῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἰδίᾳ, ἐν ᾗ νόμιμον εἶναι ταῖς γυναιξὶ μὴ γεύσασθαι τῶν ἐκείνοις θυομένων.

134

At certain times, the Atreidai, Tydeidai, Aiakidai and Laertiadai received *enagizein* sacrifices, while on another special day, the Agamemnonidai were given a *thysia*. The text further specifies, that at the sacrifice to the Agamemnonidai, it was not the custom for the women to taste the meat from the victims sacrificed to these heroes (μὴ γεύσασθαι τῶν ἐκείνοις θυομένων). On the basis that the *thysia* included consumption, it is reasonable to view the *enagizein* sacrifices to the Atreidai, Tydeidai, Aiakidai and Laertiadai as not including any ritual dining. The context of the *On marvellous things heard* where this information is given, mentions other cults and temples at various locations. This particular passage is very brief, however, and nothing further is known as to where and when these sacrifices took place and whether the recipients had any particular characteristics.

135

The final passage in which *enagizein* is used for sacrifices to a hero during this period is Herodotos' well-known account of the double cult of Herakles (2.44).

καὶ δοκέουσι δέ μοι οὗτοι ὀρθότατα Ἑλλήνων ποιέειν, οἱ διζὰ Ἡράκλεια ἰδρυσάμενοι ἔκτενται, καὶ τῷ μὲν ὡς ἀθανάτῳ Ὀλυμπίῳ δὲ ἐπωνυμίην θύουσι, τῷ δὲ ἑτέρῳ ὡς ἥρῳ ἐναγίζουσι.

136

According to Herodotos, those Greeks who had two cults of Herakles were behaving in the most correct fashion. They sacrificed to Herakles, on the one hand, as to an immortal, calling him Olympian, ὡς ἀθανάτῳ Ὀλυμπίῳ δὲ ἐπωνυμίην θύουσι, and, on the other, as to a hero, ὡς ἥρῳ ἐναγίζουσι. The use of the two terms *thyein* and *enagizein* in this passage clearly reflects two kinds of sacrificial rituals,

just like the description of the sacrifices to the various groups of heroes at Taras in the *On marvellous things heard* (840a).

281

137

If the context in which Herodotos makes this statement is taken into account, it is clear that he is recommending a dual ritual to be performed to Herakles, owing to his specific background. The original Herakles was a Phoenician god with temples both in Tyre and on Thasos.

282

The Greek Herakles, on the other hand, was a son of Amphitryon, born at least five generations after the construction of the temple on Thasos. This duality in character is the reason why he is supposed to receive two kinds of cult. A hero who has a divine side clearly distinguishable from an early period, is a unique feature in Greek religion and Herodotos' separation of the two kinds of cult should be viewed as an expression of the special position of Herakles. The notion that Herakles was partly an immortal god and partly a mortal hero is mentioned as early as in the *Odyssey* and a further indication of his mixed status can be found in Pindar, who calls him *heros theos*.

283

Moreover, Herakles was worshipped all over the Greek territory and there is no tradition of him having a tomb, only the pyre on Mount Oite, on which he burnt himself to death and then ascended to Olympos.

284

138

The exceptional position of Herakles in the Herodotos passage becomes even more apparent if the treatment of heroes at large in Herodotos is considered. A recent study has shown that clear-cut distinctions between gods and heroes are far from a hallmark of Herodotos.

285

Apart from this specific passage, he makes little or no distinction between gods and heroes in discussing matters of religion. Heroes may even be referred to as *theoi*, when he is concerned with their religious roles or offerings made to them.

286

139

The remaining cases of *enagizein*, *enagisma* or *enagismos* in the early sources concern sacrifices to the ordinary dead (Table 11). In all, these terms are more frequently used for covering rituals in the cult of the dead than for sacrifices to heroes. The contexts are more uniform and related to the regular ritual practices devoted to the dead, which do not seem to have included any exceptional behaviour. In the funerary contexts, we get more information on what actions took place, and it is clear that the terms could cover different kinds of rituals. *Enagizein* could refer to the whole ritual complex, performed annually at the tomb, as in Isaios 2.46, where the orator states that a person who dies without an heir will not receive these rituals. The same meaning is found in 7.30, where Isaios speaks about the necessity for a dying person to arrange for someone to perform sacrifices (ὁ ἐναγιῶν) and carry out the customary rites (πάντα τὰ νομιζόμενα ...). The *enagizein* sacrifice probably took place at the tomb, while *ta nomizomena* seems to have marked the end of the mourning period, when the family resumed their normal way of living again.

287

The 4th-century historian Dieuchidas uses *enagismoi* in a similar manner, describing how Phorbas commanded his friends to have freemen perform the *enagismoi* to him after his death.

288

Finally, Kleidemos, in his *Exegetikon*, a handbook on religious and ritual matters, mentions *enagismoi* in connection with the cult of the dead and the purification of the unclean.

289

The text, only preserved as a fragment and with a somewhat unclear content, seems to refer to the rituals performed at the tomb. The ritual described consisted in digging a trench to the west of the grave and pouring water and scented oil into it. However, it is not clear from the context whether this ritual formed a part of the *enagismoi* or whether it referred to a separate action.

Table 11. Instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the Archaic to early Hellenistic literary sources.

Greek contexts: The ordinary dead			
Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίσματα	The dead	Ar. Tag. fr. 561, 12 (PCG III:2)	5th–4th century BC
ἐναγίζεον	The dead	Isae. 2.46	5th–4th century BC
ἐναγίζεον	The dead	Isae. 6.51	5th–4th century BC
ἐναγίζεον	The dead	Isae. 6.65	5th–4th century BC
ἐναγίζεον	The dead	Isae. 7.30	5th–4th century BC
ἐναγισμοί	The dead	Kleidemnos <i>FGHHist</i> 323 F 14	4th century BC
ἐναγισμοί	Phorbas	Dieuchidas <i>FGHHist</i> 485 F 7	4th century BC
ἐναγίζεον	Charmos	Klearchos fr. 58 (Wehrli 1969)	4th–3rd century BC
ἐναγίζεον or ἐναγίσματα	The dead	Diphilos fr. 37 (PCG V)	4th–3rd century BC

140

More specifically, *enagizein* and *enagismata* could mean the non-fluid part of a funerary sacrifice. Isaios describes how the children of the deceased visit the tomb and offer sacrifices and libations, ἐναγίζουσι καὶ χέονται.

290

A fragment of Aristophanes mentions that *enagismata* are sacrificed (*thyein*) and *choai* poured to the deceased, as though to gods, and the dead are asked to send up good things to the living.

291

What was offered at the *enagizein* sacrifice to the dead is specified by Klearchos in one case, telling the story of the piper and fish-lover Technon, who sacrificed small fried fish on the tomb of his dead colleague Charmos (ἀποπυρίδας ἐπὶ τοῦ μνήματος ἐνήγιζεν αὐτῷ).

292

141

Finally, a comedy by Diphilos, entitled Ἐναγίζοντες or Ἐναγίσματα, seems to have dealt with funerary matters, but hardly anything is known of the contents of this play.

293

142

To sum up the use of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the pre-300 BC sources, the most important conclusion is that these sacrifices are connected with death, since the recipients are all dead persons, either heroes or the departed. The terms are more frequently used for sacrifices to the ordinary dead than to heroes.

143

Since the terms seem to have been mainly used for the regular

sacrifices to the departed, it is possible that the use of *enagizein* sacrifices in the cult of the heroes functioned as a way of connecting these recipients with the sphere of death. There are several factors supporting such an interpretation. The site where the Phokaians had been killed, and presumably buried, was of central importance for the institution of the cult and the sacrifices are likely to have taken place at that location. The sacrifices to Harmodios and Aristogeiton were probably also focused on their grave. Death itself was also significant (the manner of death and its consequences). Herakles committed suicide by burning himself and both the Phokaians and Harmodios and Aristogeiton died particularly violent deaths, which in the case of the Phokaians led to severe problems that could be solved only by instituting a cult. The cult functioned as an appeasement of the anger of the killed men and solved the difficulties arising from the death of the heroes.

144

If we assume that death was an important aspect of heroes receiving *enagizein* sacrifices, it is also possible to argue that these sacrifices could function to mark the recipient as being different from, or at least removed from, an immortal god on the conceptual level. Herakles has both an immortal side as a god and a mortal side as a hero and therefore receives both *thyein* and *enagizein* sacrifices. However, the distinction can also apply to various groups of heroes who are more or less mortal or immortal, as in the case of the Atreidai, Tydeidai, Aiakidai and Laertiadai, who received *enagizein* sacrifices at Taras, while the Agamemnonidai were given a *thysia*.

145

Concerning the contents of the ritual actions, none of the sources offer any detailed descriptions but the use of the terminology gives indications of what kinds of sacrifices were meant. The contrasting of *enagizein* and *thyein* is an argument in favour of the terms referring to two kinds of rituals, *enagizein* covering a kind of sacrifice different from *thyein*, namely a sacrifice not followed by collective dining. Presumably the offerings at an *enagizein* sacrifice were destroyed in one way or another.

294

The use of *enagismata* and *choai* to describe the rituals performed at the tomb is also of interest in this context, since this division

indicates that *enagizein* sacrifices are likely to have consisted not only of libations but of some kind of food-stuff or of animal victims, depending on who was the recipient.

3.2.2. *Enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the post-300 BC sources

146

In the sources dating to after 300 BC, the three terms *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are used for sacrifices to three kinds of recipients. The two main recipients are the same as in the earlier sources: heroes and the ordinary dead. To these can be added a new group found only in the later sources: gods.

Table 12. Number of instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the post-300 BC sources.

Recipient	Greek contexts	Roman contexts	Other contexts	Total
Heroes	72	10	—	82
Ordinary dead	14	11	4	29
Gods	8	—	8	16
Total	94	21	12	127

Instances are divided according to the recipients (unidentified recipients have been left out) and their cultural contexts. On the Roman “heroes”, see below, pp. 106–108. The “gods” group includes *daimones*.

147

In the earlier sources, the terms are used only for sacrifices in contexts that are Greek or have a Greek origin. In the post-300 BC material, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are most frequently found in Greek contexts, but the terms can also cover Roman sacrifices, as well as occasional instances of other contexts (Egyptian, Hebrew and Carthaginian). The tables 12 and 13 illustrate the general spread of the use of the terms for various kinds of recipients, cultural contexts and dates.

Table 13. Chronological spread of the post-300 BC sources that use *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the respective contexts.

Date	Greek contexts	Roman contexts	Other contexts	Total
3rd century BC	2 (2)	–	–	2 (2)
3rd–2nd century BC	1 (1)	–	–	1 (1)
1st century BC	2 (2)	1 (1)	–	3 (3)
1st century BC to 1st century AD	5 (5)	–	–	5 (5)
1st century AD	–	1 (–)	4 (–)	5 (–)
1st–2nd century AD	15 (12)	19 (9)	4 (–)	38 (21)
2nd century AD	35 (29)	–	–	35 (29)
2nd–3rd century AD	15 (12)	–	–	15 (12)
3rd century AD	12 (7)	–	3 (–)	15 (7)
3rd–4th century AD	1 (–)	–	–	1 (–)
4th century AD	6 (2)	–	–	6 (2)
4th–5th century AD	–	–	1 (–)	1 (–)
Total	94 (72)	21 (10)	12 (–)	127 (82)

Each context includes all three categories of recipients (heroes, the ordinary dead and gods). The figures in parentheses indicate the number of sacrifices to heroes for each context and period.

148

The majority of the sources deal with Greek religious contexts and the Roman and other contexts make up only a third of the Greek cases.

149

In the Greek contexts, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are found most frequently in connection with heroes (77 %). The instances of sacrifices to the deceased covered by these terms make up only about one-seventh of the total number of cases, and the contexts in which the recipients are gods are even fewer (8 %). This can be compared with the use of the terms in the earlier sources (even though the total sample for that period is much smaller): four instances of sacrifices to heroes and nine instances of sacrifices to the ordinary dead.

150

The Roman contexts are more evenly spread between heroes (ten cases) and the ordinary dead (eleven cases). At the same time, it should be noted that these two categories are more difficult to separate in the Roman contexts than in the Greek.

295

The small but mixed group of other contexts (Egyptian, Hebrew and Carthaginian) contains no sacrifices that could be considered as being to heroes and only a few concerning the ordinary dead. Here, instead,

the gods dominate.

151

If the chronological distribution of the sources using *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* is considered, almost 60 % of the texts date to the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. Sources dating to the later 2nd and 3rd centuries AD make up an additional 25 % of the total number of instances. This remarkable peak is due to the popularity of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in certain sources. For example, Pausanias uses the terms 30 times (only for Greek contexts), Plutarch 20 times (seven Greek contexts, twelve Roman and one other context), Philostratos eleven times (all Greek contexts) and Heliodoros ten times (seven Greek contexts and three other contexts).

296

Of these sources, Pausanias stands out, not only because of his frequent use of the terms, but because he never uses them for sacrifices to the dead. In Plutarch, Philostratos and Heliodoros, on the other hand, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* cover sacrifices to heroes, ordinary dead and gods alike. From this review, it is clear that 55 % of the instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are found in four sources only, dating from the 1st to the 3rd centuries AD, while the remaining 45 % are spread between about 25 different sources dating from the 3rd century BC to the 5th century AD.

3.2.2.1. Greek contexts: Heroes

152

From the use of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the earlier sources, it was suggested that the three terms were used for sacrifices in hero-cults that were particularly connected with the burial and the tomb of the hero, for heroes who had died a violent death and for whom the sacrifice seems to have served as some kind of appeasement, and finally as a marker of the hero's mortality as a contrast to the immortality of the gods. A similar pattern of usage of the terms can be traced also in the sources dating to after 300 BC.

Table 14. Instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the post-300 BC literary sources.

Greek contexts: Heroes			
Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίζειν	Chrysos	Hippoc. [Ép.] 27 (Littré 1839–61, vol. 9, 414)	Hellenistic
ἐναγίζειν	Polykrite	Andriskos <i>FGrHist</i> 500 F 1	3rd century BC
ἐναγίζειν	Xanthos	Polyb. 23.10.17	3rd–2nd century BC
ἐναγίσματα	Achilles, Aias and the rest	Diod. Sic. 17.17.3	1st century BC
ἐναγισμοί	War dead	Dion. Hal. <i>Thuc.</i> 18.6	1st century BC
ἐναγισμός	Neleids	Strabon 6.1.15	1st century BC to 1st century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Kalchas	Strabon 6.3.9	1st century BC to 1st century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Achilles, Patroklos, Antilochos and Aias	Strabon 13.1.32 (twice)	1st century BC to 1st century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Amphilochos	Strabon 14.5.17	1st century BC to 1st century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω	Herakles	Apollod. <i>Bibl.</i> 2.5.1	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς νεκρῶ	Herakles	Apollod. <i>Bibl.</i> 2.5.1	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Hippokrates	Sor. <i>Vit. Hipp.</i> 3.6	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγισμός	Hephaistion	Plut. <i>Vit. Alex.</i> 72.3	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Konnidas	Plut. <i>Vit. Thes.</i> 4.1	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	War dead at Plataiai	Plut. <i>Vit. Arist.</i> 21.2	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς θεοῖς καὶ ἥρωσιν	Herakles and Dionysos	Plut. <i>De malign. Her.</i> 857d	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	War dead at Plataiai	Plut. <i>De malign. Her.</i> 872f	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω	Herakles	Ptolemaios Chennos 3.12 (Chatzis 1914)	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρωσιν	Heroes	Dio Chrys. <i>Or.</i> 15.10	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὅσα ἥρω	Amphilochos	Arr. <i>Anab.</i> 2.5.9	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ἥρω	Hephaistion	Arr. <i>Anab.</i> 7.14.7	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Pyrros	Paus. 1.4.4	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω	Herakles	Paus. 2.10.1 (twice)	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω	Alexanor	Paus. 2.11.7	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Phoroneus	Paus. 2.20.3	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς οὐδίστη	Theras	Paus. 3.1.8	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Hyakinthos	Paus. 3.19.3	2nd century AD

Table 14 (continued)

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίζειν	Eurytos	Paus. 4.3.10	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Aristomenes	Paus. 4.32.3	2nd century AD
ἐναγισμὸς	Augeas	Paus. 5.4.3	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Aitolos	Paus. 5.4.4	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Suitors of Hippodameia	Paus. 6.21.11	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Sostratos	Paus. 7.17.8	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Oibotas	Paus. 7.17.14	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Eurypylos	Paus. 7.19.10	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Preugenes	Paus. 7.20.9	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Talthybios	Paus. 7.24.1	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω	Iphikles	Paus. 8.14.10	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Myrtilos	Paus. 8.14.11	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Children of Kaphyai	Paus. 8.23.7	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρωσιν	War dead from Oresthasion	Paus. 8.41.1	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Thersander	Paus. 9.5.14	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Skedasos and his daughters	Paus. 9.13.6	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Children of Oidipous	Paus. 9.18.3–4 (twice)	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Pionis	Paus. 9.18.4	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Linos	Paus. 9.29.6	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Aktaion	Paus. 9.38.5	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Neoptolemos	Paus. 10.24.6	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Children of Medea	Ael. <i>VH</i> 5.21	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Alexander	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 68.30.1	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγισμοῦ	Achilles	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 78.16.7	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγισμοῦ	Achilles	Philostr. <i>VA</i> 4.16	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγισμοῦ	Achilles	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 52.3	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγισμοῦ	Achilles	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 53.8	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Achilles	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 53.13	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγίζειν ὡς τεθνεῶσι	Achilles	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 53.15	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγισμοῦ	Achilles	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 53.17	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Achilles	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 53.17	2nd–3rd century AD

Table 14 (continued)

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίζματα	Achilles	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 53.19	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγίζματα	Alexander	Herodian. <i>Div. Marc.</i> 4.8.7	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγίζματα	Esaimon	Philostr. <i>Imag.</i> 2.16.3	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζαν	Heroes at the Academy	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 1.17.5	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζματος	Neoptolemos	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 2.34.7	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζματος	Neoptolemos	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 2.35.2	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζματα	Neoptolemos	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 2.35.3	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζματος	Neoptolemos	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 3.1.1	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζματος	Neoptolemos	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 4.20.3	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζματα	Child who committed suicide	Sopater <i>Diatr. vet.</i> 233	4th century AD
ἐναγίζαν	War dead at Plataiai	Tib. <i>Decl.</i> 13.59	4th century AD

153

The burial and the tomb of the hero feature prominently in more than half of the passages in which *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are used for the sacrifices. This connection is particularly clear in Pausanias. In those cases in which he describes the cult place as being connected with a burial (*taphos*, *mnema*, *polyandrion*, *choma ges*) or mentions the fact that the hero was buried or his bones kept, the term for the sacrificial activity is *enagizein*.

297

Most of these sacrifices seem to have been performed at the actual tomb of the hero. On the other hand, when Pausanias calls the cult place a *hieron*, *temenos*, *naos*, *alsos*, *heroon*, *kenon erion* (empty mound), *bomos* or *bothros*, the terms for the sacrifices are *thyein* or *thysia*.

298

Even if there was a burial also at these cult places, it does not seem to have been a prominent feature.

154

The tombs of some of the heroes who fell at Troy were also honoured with *enagizein* sacrifices.

299

The sacrifices to Achilles, centred on his burial mound, are described in great detail by Philostratos.

300

Neoptolemos received *enagizein* sacrifices at Delphi, presumably at his tomb, which was circled three times by the procession which took place in connection with the *enagismata* performed by the Ainianes, according to Heliodoros.

301

Chrysos, a warrior killed at Delphi in the first Sacred War, was buried in the hippodrome and given *enagizein* sacrifices by the Delphians at public expense.

302

The 4th-century AD rhetor Sopater tells the story of a young boy, who committed suicide to save his city from a plague and who was buried, honoured and given *enagismoi* to keep him friendly and gracious.

303

The sacrifices to the war dead buried at Plataiai, which took place at their tomb, are described as *enagizein* by Plutarch.

304

Also in the cults of the oikists, in which the tombs were of great importance, the term *enagizein* could be used for the sacrifices.

305

155

The *enagizein* sacrifices could also be particularly linked to the rituals performed at the burial, which did not necessarily mean the institution of a recurrent cult. At the public burial of Polykrite, who was killed by accident after having helped to defend her city against the Milesians, the Naxians sacrificed (*enagisantes*) a hundred sheep.

306

Plutarch describes Alexander's attempts to institute a cult to Hephaistion after his death.

307

The oracle of Ammon ordered that Hephaistion was to be honoured and receive sacrifices as a hero, τιμᾶν Ἡφαιστίωνα καὶ θύειν ὡς ἥρω. Before the burial and the construction of the tomb, Alexander attacked and slaughtered the Kossaians, an act which was called an *enagismos* to Hephaistion and which can be seen as an extreme form of funerary sacrifice.

308

To this context can also be added the *enagizein* sacrifice performed by Trajan to Alexander in Babylon in the very room where he had died.

309

156

The importance of the actual dead state of the heroes receiving *enagizein* sacrifices is clear from the prominent place which the tomb and the burial occupy in many of these cults. The manner in which the hero died is also of interest and further emphasizes the fact that he is dead. In about one-fourth of the cases, the heroes perished

violently. Many of the heroes receiving *enagizein* sacrifices were killed in battle: for example, the war dead buried at Plataiai, whose cult is described in detail by Plutarch, the Athenians who fell in Sicily, the men of Oresthasion, who had to die in order to help the inhabitants of Phigaleia and who had a *polyandron* in that city, Thersander, who had a monument in the agora of Elaia, as well as Chrysos, killed in the first Sacred War and buried in the hippodrome at Delphi.

310

To this group can be added Iphikles, who died from wounds received in battle and Polykrite, who helped her fellow citizens in war and was killed by accident.

311

Also the sacrifices to the heroes Achilles, Aias, Antilochos and Patroklos, all killed at Troy, are covered by *enagizein* or *enagismata*

312

The *enagizein* sacrifices to Xanthos in Macedonia may also have had a connection with war, since they took place at the same time as the annual purification of the army.

313

157

Other recipients of *enagizein* sacrifices were murdered and sometimes not even properly buried. The suitors of Hippodameia were killed by Oinomaos and only scantily buried, until Pelops provided them with a proper monument.

314

Oinomaos' charioteer Myrtilos was drowned by Pelops and not buried until the corpse was taken care of by the people of Pheneos.

315

A violent, unjust death and the lack of a proper burial might lead to grave consequences that had to be remedied by a cult that aimed at soothing the anger of the hero. Pausanias tells the story of the children of Kaphyai, who pretended to hang a statue of Artemis and were therefore stoned by the enraged Kaphyans.

316

After this, the women began to have miscarriages, until the Pythia ordered the Kaphyans to bury the children and perform annual *enagizein* sacrifices to them, since they had died unjustly. This course of events shows a striking similarity to Herodotos' account of the Phokaians, who were stoned by the people of Agylla and whose unjust deaths and the effects thereof also led to the institution of a cult

Another example is the children of Medea, who, according to Claudius Aelianus, were killed by the Corinthians and not by their mother.

317

This scandalous act led the Corinthians to perform *enagizein* sacrifices to the children, as if to give them a tribute, an action which must also have functioned as a kind of propitiation.

318

The herald Talthybios had tombs in both Athens and Sparta and received sacrifices at both locations.

319

The appeasement of Talthybios was linked to his revenge for the murder of the Persian heralds sent to Greece to demand earth and water for king Darius, a revenge which in Laconia fell on the whole people, but in Athens only on the family of Miltiades.

320

An improper burial also seems to have been a direct cause of the institution of a cult, as in the case of Aktaion, whose unburied remains the Orchomenians had to cover with earth in order to get rid of a creature who was devastating the region with rocks.

321

The Orchomenians also performed annual *enagizein* sacrifices to the hero.

A few heroes who received *enagizein* sacrifices had committed suicide. The daughters of Skedastos hanged themselves after they had been raped by two Spartans, and their father also committed suicide, after trying in vain to seek justice at Sparta.

322

This event took place at Leuktra and Epaminondas sacrificed (ἐνήγισε) to Skedastos and his daughters at that location before the battle in 371 BC, implying that the struggle would seek to avenge them.

323

Similarly, a young boy, mentioned in one of the declamation themes by Sopater, had committed suicide to save his city from a plague and was therefore given *enagismoι* to keep him friendly and gracious.

324

All these heroes died violent deaths, often connected with war and occasionally leading to difficulties among those who had carried out the killing. In the latter cases, in which the hero's anger led to the institution of the cult, the *enagizein* sacrifices must have served as an appeasement of the hero. This is not necessarily true of the heroes killed in war, even though there is some evidence that soldiers fallen in battle may have been counted among the *biaiothanatoi*, at least in the Roman period.

325

In any case, the fact that the heroes had died violently seems to have emphasized their status as belonging to the dead and constituted a reason why they were given *enagizein* sacrifices.

161

The third category of usage of *enagizein* in the earlier sources was to mark the mortal side of the hero, i.e., the fact that he was dead, as a contrast to the immortal side connected with the gods. In more than a third of the post-300 BC instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos*, the terms occur in contexts contrasting the heroic and the divine, emphasizing the recipients' mortality and immortality, respectively. Such a contrast can be found in the same recipient, as in the case of Herakles, or concern two different recipients, usually a hero and a god, but in some instances two heroes. The contrast is usually expressed by *enagizein* being opposed to another ritual, predominantly *thyein* or *thysia*, and more rarely *timan*. The hero receiving the *enagizein* sacrifices could also be buried in or near the sanctuary of a god and receive sacrifices in connection with the worship of a god.

162

The particular case of Herakles, who started off as a mortal hero and ended as an immortal god, is commented upon by several sources. The question of the heroic and the divine sides of Herakles and their reflection in the terminology and the sacrificial rituals seems to have been initiated by Herodotos (2.44) and to have worried scholars ever since. Plutarch comments directly on the position of Herodotos in his critical work on that author.

326

According to Plutarch, Herodotos considered the Herakles and the Dionysos worshipped by the Egyptians as ancient gods, while the

Herakles and the Dionysos worshipped by the Greeks were in origin mortal men. To the latter pair, Herodotos thought it proper to ὡς (φθιτοῖς καὶ ἥρωσιν ἐναγίζειν, but not to θύειν ὡς θεοῖς, a position of which Plutarch disapproved. The double ritual to Herakles is also mentioned by Ptolemaios Chennos and Pausanias, both contrasting ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω with θύειν ὡς θεῷ.

327

163

Few other heroes show the same characteristics as Herakles. The closest case is Achilles, who, just like Herakles, seems to have been considered more of a god than a hero.

328

According to Strabon, Achilles had both a *mnema* and a *hieron* near Sigeion and the Ilians performed *enagizein* sacrifices to him, as well as honouring him as a god, the first ritual presumably taking place at the *mnema* and the second at the *hieron*.

329

The sacrifices to Achilles by the Thessalians, described by Philostratos, explicitly emphasized his two sides.

330

The *enagizein* sacrifice was centred on his burial mound and clearly underlined the recipient's character as dead, since the black bull sacrificed was slaughtered as to a deceased person, ὡς τεθνεῶτι ἔσφαττον. The second part of the sacrifice, which took place on the beach, was a *thysia* with all its particular details and was specified as being performed as to a god (ἔθυσον γὰρ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην ὡς θεῷ).

164

The cult of Hephaistion ordered by Alexander also involved two kinds of rituals, but they do not seem to have been acted out at the same time. After the death of Hephaistion, Alexander ordered that there should always be *enagizein* sacrifices to Hephaistion as a hero.

331

At the same time, he asked the oracle of Ammon whether it would also be permissible to ὡς θεῷ θύειν to Hephaistion, but the oracle did not give its consent to consider Hephaistion as a god. The aim here seems to have been to promote a hero to a god, rather than to emphasize the two sides of the cult.

332

165

It was unusual for the same recipient to receive both *enagizein* and *thyein* sacrifices. More frequently, *enagizein* is used for a sacrifice to a hero in a context that also mentions a god. The sacrifice to the hero could be performed in connection with the sacrifice to the god, and the latter ritual was then covered by *thyein* or *thysia*. For example, at Amyklai, before the *thysiai* to Apollon, Hyakinthos received *enagizein* sacrifices through a bronze door of the altar of the god.

333

Linos was annually given *enagizein* sacrifices before the *thysiai* to the Muses on Mount Helikon.

334

Alexanor and Euamerion, both having statues located in the sanctuary of Asklepios at Titane, also had contrasting rituals, the sacrifices to Alexanor being ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω and those to Euamerion θύειν ὡς θεῷ.

335

Apollodoros tells the story of how Herakles, on his way to Nemea to kill the lion, stayed with Molorchos at Kleonai.

336

Molorchos wanted to sacrifice a victim (*thyein hiereion*) but was told by Herakles to wait thirty days and, if Herakles had returned safely by then, to perform a *thyein* sacrifice to Zeus Soter, but, if not, ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω. On the thirtieth day, Herakles came back and found Molorchos about ὡς νεκρῷ τὸ ἱερεῖον ἐναγίζειν (perform an *enagizein* sacrifice of an animal victim as to a dead person). Since he was alive, Herakles performed a *thysia* to Zeus Soter.

166

In other cases, the contrast between the heroic and the divine is marked by the hero who received the *enagizein* sacrifice being buried in or near a sanctuary of a god or a goddess, for example, Neoptolemos in the sanctuary of Apollon at Delphi.

337

167

Finally, in two instances, both in Plutarch, *enagizein* or *enagismata* are used in contexts of contrast, which seem to involve only heroes.

338

Plutarch states that to Konnidas, the teacher of Theseus, the Athenians *enagizousi* a ram on the day before the Theseia.

339

Theseus and Konnidas can be regarded as a major and a minor hero,

but it is also possible that Plutarch considered Theseus as being more of a god than a hero. The other case concerns Hephaestion, who was given *thyein* sacrifices ὡς ἥρω as well as *enagismata*.

340

The *thyein* sacrifices were his regular cult, approved of by the oracle of Ammon. The *enagismata*, on the other hand, can be seen as a funerary sacrifice, emphasizing the dead side of the recipient, since they were performed on a single occasion before the burial and consisted in the massacre of a group of people (see above, p. 95).

168

This review of the use of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* for sacrifices to heroes in the post-300 BC sources shows that the terms are used in contexts similar to those found in the earlier sources. The heroes receiving the *enagizein* sacrifices have a close connection with death. Their tombs are important in the cult; they often died violent deaths and occasionally caused difficulties, once dead. The cult is frequently contrasted with the cult of a god.

169

Finally, the contents of the rituals should be considered. From the contrast between *enagizein* and *thyein*, it is clear that the two terms refer to two different kinds of rituals. Pausanias is particularly explicit in describing the dual sacrifices to Herakles at Sikyon.

341

According to him, the Sikyonians slaughter (*sphaxantes*) a lamb and burn the thigh-bones on the *bomos*. Some of the meat is eaten, as from an ordinary victim (ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερείου), while they sacrifice other parts of the meat as to a hero (ὡς ἥρω τῶν κρετῶν ἐναγίζουσιν). The latter ritual must have meant a destruction of the meat, probably by burning it. The *enagizein* sacrifice cannot simply have meant that the blood was poured out, since it took place after the animal had been slaughtered and explicitly involved the meat. It is interesting to note that the same animal could be used for the two rituals. The sacrifice was initiated as a regular *thysia*, where the thigh-bones were burnt, followed by the dining on the meat, but a certain quantity was destroyed as well.

170

Philostratos gives a detailed account of the sacrifices to Achilles at Troy, performed by the Thessalians.

342

These rituals also consisted of two parts: an *enagizein* sacrifice at the burial mound and a *thysia* sacrifice on the beach. The first sacrifice was directed to Achilles as a hero, clearly underlining his dead state. The burial mound was garlanded, *bothroi* were dug out, a black bull was slaughtered as to a deceased (ὥς τεθνεῶτι ἔσφαττον), and Achilles and Patroklos were invited to the *dais*. To describe the whole ceremony, Philostratos uses *entemnein* and *enagizein*, indicating that the sacrifice consisted both in the handling of the blood of the bull, which must have been poured into the *bothroi*, and in the destruction of the meat, either by burning it or by simply leaving the carcass at the site.

343

The second part of the sacrifice took place on the beach where the Thessalians had landed. They sacrificed a white bull (verb *thyein*), initiating the ritual with barley from a reed basket and with the handling of the *splanchna*, since this sacrifice was performed as to a god (ἔθυσον γὰρ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην ὥς θεῷ). Finally, they sailed away, taking the animal victim with them, in order to avoid feasting in the enemy's country (ὥς μὴ ἐν τῇ πολεμία εὐωχοῖντο).

171

The two ceremonies are clearly contrasted, consisting of different actions but directed to different aspects of the same recipient. At the *enagizein* sacrifice to the dead hero, there was no dining for the worshippers. The meat was either destroyed or left at the tomb. The *dais* seems to have been given only to Achilles and Patroklos and probably consisted of the blood of the victim, as well as the carcass, and not a proper meal sacrifice, since there is no indication of a *kline*, table or food offerings. At the *thysia* to the god Achilles, on the other hand, the meat was kept and eaten, even if the dining did not take place at the site of the sacrifice.

172

A third passage of great interest in understanding the meaning of *enagizein* is Plutarch's description of the sacrifices to the war dead at Plataiai, performed annually by the Plataians on behalf of all the Greeks.

344

The whole ritual complex is designated by *enagizein*, but a number of other terms are used to cover various parts of the sacrifice. In a

procession to the burial site, there were brought a black bull, jars of wine and milk, pitchers of oil and myrrh, water and myrtle wreaths. The gravestones were washed and anointed with myrrh. The bull was slaughtered (*sphaxas*) at the funeral pyre by the archon, using a sword instead of a knife, and the fallen Greeks were called to come to the *deipnon* and the *haimakouria*. Finally, a libation of water and wine was poured out.

The term *deipnon* usually refers to food offerings, often of the kind not meant to be eaten.

345

It is possible that the *deipnon* in this case consisted of the slaughtered bull, of which no part was eaten by the worshippers. There is no reason to interpret the sacrifice in general, and the *deipnon* in particular, as a *theoxenia* where food would have been displayed.

346

The meat may have been completely burnt, perhaps on the old funeral pyre, or left on the site of the sacrifice. The rare term *haimakouria* meant an offering of blood.

347

The war dead were invited to come to the *deipnon* and drink the blood, just as Achilles and Patroklos were invited to the *dais* and offerings of blood at Troy. In any case, there is no indication of the worshippers dining on the meat at this sacrifice.

These three sources support the interpretation of *enagizein* as meaning a sacrifice not including any dining by the worshippers. Moreover, Plutarch uses *enagismos* referring to the slaughter of humans, and in Polybios the victims used for the *enagizein* sacrifice were horses: in neither of these cases would there be any meat to dine on.

348

The bull sacrificed to Aristomenes at Messene was probably not eaten, since Pausanias never seems to use *enagizein* for a sacrifice involving dining.

349

In all, the frequent contrasting of *enagizein* and *thyein* can be taken as a further indication that *enagizein* refers to a non-participation sacrifice. In fact, in none of the contexts in which *enagizein* is used, apart from one case in a late source, is there any evidence that any form of dining took place. The exception is found in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodoros. Here, the *enagismos* to Neoptolemos at Delphi consisted of

bulls, lambs and goats being sacrificed (*hiereuonto*); their extremities were burnt on a *bomos* and the ritual concluded with a banquet.

350

175

In many cases, the sources offer no information on what was sacrificed at the *enagizein* sacrifices to heroes, but when the offerings are specified, they consist of animal victims. A bull was sacrificed to the war dead at Plataiai, to Achilles at Troy, to Aristomenes at Messene and to Palaimon at Isthmia.

351

Herakles at Sikyon was given lambs and at the burial of Polykrite 100 sheep were sacrificed.

352

The consultants of the oracle of Kalchas at Daunian in southern Italy sacrificed black sheep and slept in the hides.

353

Konnidas, the teacher of Theseus, received a ram on the day before the Theseia.

354

At the *enagizein* sacrifice performed to the dead Herakles as a hero in Apollodoros' *Bibliotheca*, the victim is a *hiereion*.

355

The *enagismos* to Neoptolemos at Delphi consisted of a hecatomb of oxen, as well as lambs and goats.

356

176

Enagizein and the two related nouns rarely seem to cover libations. There are two possible cases. The *enagizein* sacrifice to Hyakinthos at Amyklai was performed through a door in the altar of Apollon, where the hero was buried.

357

Since the sacrifice took place in the altar, it is unlikely to have involved the use of fire. It may have consisted of some kind of libation, of blood or perhaps of a deposition of meat. The other case is found in Philostratos, who states that something was mixed with (ἐγκαταμικγνύντες) the *enagismata* to Achilles at Troy, which may imply that they consisted of some kind of liquid.

358

3.2.2.2. Greek contexts: The ordinary dead

In the post-300 BC sources, as in the earlier sources, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* could refer to the sacrifices performed at the burial, as well as to the regular funerary cult (see Table 15).

359

In some cases, when the activities are outlined in more detail, *enagizein* and *enagismata* cover one part of the ritual, which also consisted of various kinds of libations (*choai*, *melikraton*), deposition of *popana* and wreathing of the gravestone.

360

Enagizein and *enagismata* usually seem to have referred to the offerings of food. In Lucian, the *enagismata* were brought to the grave site: the gravestone was drenched with myrrh and crowned with wreaths, while the visitors themselves enjoyed the food and drink that had been prepared.

361

In another passage from Lucian, the *enagizein* sacrifices at the tomb are contrasted with a *thysia*, at which animal victims were sacrificed and eaten.

362

The context concerns Hippokrates, who is said to have been upset when his annual *thysia* was late. One of the two physicians participating in the discussion exclaims that things have gone too far when even Hippokrates demands *thyein* sacrifices and to be feasted on animal victims, when he should be content if someone gives him *enagizein* sacrifices, pours out *melikraton* and puts wreaths on his gravestone.

178

Enagizein rarely seems to have meant animal sacrifices to the ordinary dead. The only clear case is found in Plutarch but concerns the conditions in a much earlier period.

363

In describing the laws of Solon dealing with funerary practices, Plutarch states that these laws, among other things, did not allow the *enagizein* of an ox and forbade the women to bring more than one obol's worth of food and drink to the grave. In this case, the *enagizein* sacrifice was a ritual separate from the food offerings.

Greek contexts: The ordinary dead			
Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίζειν	The dead	Plut. <i>Vit. Sol.</i> 21.5	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγισμός	Pyrrhos' dead son	Plut. <i>Vit. Pyrrh.</i> 31.1	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	The dead	Plut. <i>Quaest. Rom.</i> 270a	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγισματα	The dead	Lucian <i>Catapl.</i> 2	2nd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	Hippokrates	Lucian <i>Philops.</i> 21	2nd century AD
ἐναγισματα	The dead	Lucian <i>De merc.</i> 28	2nd century AD
ἐναγισματα	The dead	Ael. Arist. <i>Smyrna</i> 9	2nd century AD
ἐναγισματα	Alas	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 31.8	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	The dead	Philostr. <i>Her.</i> 53.23	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγισματα	Polyneikes	Philostr. <i>Imag.</i> 2.29.4	3rd century AD
ἐναγισματα	Dead members of Epikouros' family	Diog. Laert. 10.18	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	The dead	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 2.18.2	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζειν	The dead	Sopater <i>Diatr. xet.</i> 200	4th century AD
ἐναγίζειν	The dead	Lib. <i>Progyrn.</i> 2.13	4th century AD

179

In general, the *enagizein* sacrifices do not seem to have been eaten. Lucian makes fun of those who eat and drink the *enagismata* brought to the tomb.

364

Any food offerings could have been left at the grave or perhaps burnt. Fire was at least used for the *enagismata* to Polyneikes, as shown on a painting described by Philostratos.

365

In some instances, the offerings could not be eaten. In Sopater, the victims slaughtered at the tombs for the *enagizein* sacrifices were prisoners of war.

366

When Pyrrhos' son had been killed by the Spartans, Pyrrhos, in his fury, annihilated the attackers to vent his grief: this action is called an *enagismos* and preceded the funeral games to the dead son.

367

180

The *enagizein* sacrifices were performed in an atmosphere of gloom and dread. Aelius Aristides compares the day on which an earthquake destroyed Smyrna to the day when the *enagismata* are brought.

368

Lucian has Charon complain that in Hades there are only asphodels,

choai, popana, enagismata and misty darkness.

369

According to Plutarch, the *enagizein* sacrifices to the dead, as well as certain purification rituals, took place in the month dedicated to the gods of the underworld.

370

When no regular funerary offerings (*ta nomizomena*) were available, the mourners could sacrifice their tears and lamentations instead.

371

3.2.2.3. Roman and other contexts: “Heroes” and the ordinary dead

181

In all, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are less frequently used for sacrifices in the Roman and other contexts than in the Greek contexts (see Table 12, p. 89). The Roman contexts concern both heroes and the ordinary dead, while, in the few cases of other contexts, the recipients are only the departed (Tables 16–17).

182

There is no direct Roman equivalent to the Greek concept of heroes and hero-cult and the closest counterpart to a Greek hero is probably a Roman *lar*.

372

Here, the term “hero” has been applied from the Greek point of view to facilitate the comparison between the Roman contexts and the rest of the material. The reason for considering certain of these Roman recipients of *enagizein* sacrifices as heroes and not as deceased, lies in the fact that they are dead persons receiving a treatment exceeding that given to the ordinary dead. In general, the prominent Roman dead seem to have become gods and certain recipients of cult regarded as Roman heroes in the Greek sources may rather have been Roman gods seen with Greek eyes. Still, the fact that they were dead called for the use of the term *enagizein* for the sacrifices by the Greek sources. Furthermore, the Greek terminology presented the possibility of a further, non-Roman, distinction to be made.

Roman contexts: "Heroes"			
Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναργισμοί	Seduced Vestals	Dion. Hal. <i>Ant. Rom.</i> 2.67.4	1st century BC
ἐναργισμοί	Larentia	Plut. <i>Quaest. Rom.</i> 272e	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναργισμοί	Seduced Vestals	Plut. <i>Quaest. Rom.</i> 287a	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναργισμὸν	Nero	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 64.7.3	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναργισμοί	War dead killed in Dacia and Rome	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 67.9.6	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναργισμὸν	War dead killed in Dacia	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 68.8.2	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναργισμὸν	Pompey	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 69.11.1	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναργισμὸν	Pompey	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 76.13.1	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναργισμὸς	Geta	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 76.12.6	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναργισμὸν	Krixos	App. <i>B. Civ.</i> 1.117	1st–2nd century AD

183

The use of the terms for sacrifices to heroes and the ordinary dead in the Roman and other contexts are only of marginal interest here. In the Roman contexts of the *enargizein* sacrifices, it is in many cases difficult to decide whether the cult should be considered as an official hero-cult or as a kind of extended cult of the dead.

184

The Roman heroes receiving *enargizein* sacrifices are historical persons: Pompey, members of the imperial family, the Vestal Virgins, the war dead and other characters associated with Roman wars.

373

The basic connection between *enargizein* and death found in the Greek usage of the term can be found also in the Roman contexts and the authors of the Roman period writing in Greek seem to apply the Greek sense of the term to the Roman contexts. The sacrifices to the Vestal Virgins and the courtesan Larentia were performed at the grave site.

374

Most of the recipients had died violent deaths, for example, killed in war, being murdered, committing suicide or being buried alive.

375

There is only scanty information on the contents of their rituals, but they do not seem to refer to any kind of dining. The *enargizein* sacrifice to Krixos consisted in the killing of 300 Roman prisoners of war.

376

Caracalla's annual *enagismos* to Geta is depicted as a final insult to his memory, after Caracalla had exposed Geta to extensive *damnatio memoriae*.

Table 17. Instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the post-300 BC literary sources.

Roman contexts: The ordinary dead			
Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγισμοί	The dead	Joseph. <i>AJ</i> 19.272	1st century AD
ἐναγισμοί	Vindex	Plut. <i>Vit. Galb.</i> 22.2	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζων	The dead	Plut. <i>Vit. Num.</i> 19.5	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζων	Dead parents	Plut. <i>Vit. Cat. Mai.</i> 15.3	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζων	Cassius	Plut. <i>Vit. Brut.</i> 45.8	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζων	The dead	Plut. <i>Quaest. Rom.</i> 266b	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγισμοί ἐναγίζων	The dead	Plut. <i>Quaest. Rom.</i> 272d	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζων	The dead	Plut. <i>Quaest. Rom.</i> 272e	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζων	The dead	Plut. <i>Quaest. Rom.</i> 285b	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίσματα	The dead	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 64.13.5	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίσματα	The dead	Cass. Dio <i>Epit.</i> 67.9.3	1st–2nd century AD

185

The *enagizein* sacrifices to the Roman ordinary dead mainly concern references to the Roman festivals of the dead, the Parentalia and the Lemuria.

378

At the Parentalia, meals were brought to the tombs, and Plutarch mentions *choai* and *enagismoi* being offered to the dead on that occasion.

379

That food offerings were part of the rituals covered by the terms is also clear from two passages in Cassius Dio, where *enagismata* is used for funerary sacrifices of food, even though the context is not a funerary one. At a weird party given by Domitian, the guests were served with everything that was usually offered in the *enagismata* (ἐν τοῖς ἐναγίσμασι καθαγίζεται), painted black and served on black plates.

380

Another interesting use of *enagismata* is found in a conversation between two soldiers taking their last meal before a battle.

381

One of the soldiers is urging the other to eat and drink in order to

gain strength and make the hand that holds his sword grow strong and perform the killing well. He calls the food they are eating *enagismata* and says that this is given by Vitellius and Vespasian to the soldiers while they are still alive. The soldier sarcastically remarks that they themselves will then be sacrificed to the long-time dead (τοῖς πάλαι νεκροῖς καταθύσωσι). The only indication of *enagizein* referring to animal sacrifices is found in Plutarch, where Cato instructs a younger man that the *enagizein* sacrifices brought to his dead parents should not consist of lambs and kids, but of the condemnation and tears of their enemies.

382

186

The few instances of contexts that are neither Greek nor Roman concern sacrifices to the dead at Carthage and in Egypt (Table 18). In the first case, *enagizein* and *enagismata* are used for the regular funerary sacrifices to the Punic dead, which are contrasted with the *thyein* sacrifices to the gods in the sanctuaries.

383

The Egyptian sacrifice is different, since here the *enagismoι* are a magic ritual aimed at bringing a dead person back to life.

384

By performing *enagismoι* at night, an old woman tries to wake up the corpse of her dead son in order to enquire about the fate of her other son. A *bothros* is dug in the ground and the corpse is placed between two fires. Honey, milk and wine are poured into the hole. A cake shaped like a man is thrown in as well. Finally the woman draws blood from her own arm and sprinkles it on the fires. After some more rituals, no less surprising according to Heliodoros, the woman murmurs incantations in the ear of the corpse and thus makes it wake up.

Table 18. Instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the post-300 BC literary sources.

Other contexts: The ordinary dead			
Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίσματα	The dead at Carthage	App. <i>Pun.</i> 81	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγίζαν	The dead at Carthage	App. <i>Pun.</i> 89 (twice)	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγισμοί	Dead Egyptian	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 6.13.6	3rd century AD

In the later sources, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are also used for sacrifices to gods in Greek contexts (Table 19), as well as in occasional Hebrew, Egyptian and Christian cases (Table 20).

Table 19. Instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the post-300 BC literary sources.

Greek contexts: Gods			
Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίζουσιν	Black goddesses	Paus. 8.34.3	2nd century AD
ἐναγίσματα	Gods	Ael. Aris. <i>Contr. Iegz.</i> 106	2nd century AD
ἐναγίσματα	Chthonian and 'unspeakable' gods	Philostr. <i>Iler.</i> 53.5	2nd–3rd century AD
ἐναγίζουσιν	Epichthonian, heavenly, thalassian and hypochthonian gods	Porph. <i>De phl.</i> 112	3rd century AD
ἐναγίζουσιν	Chthonian gods	Porph. <i>De phl.</i> 114	3rd century AD
ἐναγίσματα	Chthonian gods	Iambli. <i>VP</i> 27.122	3rd–4th century AD
ἐναγίζουσιν	Eera Akraia	Mankellos fr. 125 (Klostermann & Hansen 1991)	4th century AD
ἐναγίσματα	<i>Dalmones</i>	Greg. Nys. <i>Encom. xl mart.</i> II 776 M	4th century AD

From the evidence discussed so far, it has been argued that *enagizein* and the two nouns have a particular connection with death. The recipients of these sacrifices are dead, their graves are central to the cult and in the case of hero-cults, the heroes have often perished violently. Moreover, heroes receiving *enagizein* sacrifices are often contrasted with gods and *thyein* sacrifices. Considering this pattern of use of the terms, it may, at first glance, seem surprising that *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* can also be used for the sacrifices to gods.

However, a number of the *enagizein* sacrifices to gods can be fitted into the previously outlined pattern of use of the terms, even though the recipients are neither heroes nor the ordinary dead. The gods receiving these sacrifices are often connected with the underworld and the rituals are performed in an atmosphere far removed from the joyful *thysia* sacrifices. Iamblichos speaks of the chthonian gods, who, contrary to the Olympians, rejoice in lamentations, dirges, *choai*, *epiphoremata* (grave offerings) and *enagismoî*.

The *enagismata* to the chthonian and unspeakable gods on Lemnos were performed annually to purify the island after the women had killed their husbands.

In a fit of madness after having killed his mother, Orestes bit off his finger and the black goddesses who had been pursuing him suddenly appeared white and benevolent. Orestes then performed an *enagizein* sacrifice to the black goddesses to turn away their anger (ἐνήγισεν ἀποτρέπων τὸ μῆνιμα αὐτῶν), followed by a *thyein* sacrifice to the same goddesses in their white aspect.

Plutarch describes the island of Philai, which was untrodden by any living creatures and on which was located the tomb of Osiris.

Once a year, the priests visited the island to perform *enagizein* sacrifices and to place wreaths on the tomb. This ritual almost bridges the gap between gods, heroes and the ordinary dead, since the recipient of the sacrifice is a god, but he is also dead. Heliodoros uses *enagizein* twice for sacrifices to gods in Egypt. In the first case, the sacrifice takes place before a battle and must have constituted a kind of *sphagia*, i.e., the slaughtering and bleeding of a victim to ascertain the right moment to attack.

The second passage in Heliodoros concerns a human sacrifice, performed as a thank-offering after a victory in war.

190

It should be noted that the extended use of *enagizein* and its two related nouns to cover rituals performed to gods is a late development: none of the sources in question is earlier than the 1st century AD. The basic meaning of the terms was a sacrifice at which the offerings were annihilated, usually by burning them and such a ritual is suitable for the contexts mentioned previously. However, at this period, the use of the terms had also been extended to mean “a complete burning of offerings, no matter who was the recipient”.

191

In the writings of Bishop Gregorios of Nyssa, the recipients of the *enagizein* sacrifice are the *daimones*, which here means the pagan gods.

The sacrifice consists of frankincense, which must have been burnt completely. A hymn by the Christian Synesios, praising the Lord, mentions *enagismata* of myrrh: an offering which must have been burnt as well.

392

The Christian use of the terms can be related to the use by Flavius Josephus of *enagismoι* for the daily sacrifices in the temple in Jerusalem.

393

The rituals that Josephus speaks of are the *tamid* sacrifices, which consisted of two daily holocausts of lambs, accompanied by a mixture of flour and oil, as well as a libation of wine.

394

At these sacrifices, there was no dining. In one of the passages, Josephus mentions the daily *thysiai*, *enagismoι* and *allai therapeiai* performed to God in the temple.

395

Here, the *enagismoι* are the holocaustic *tamid*, while the *thysiai* correspond to the *zebah selamim*, at which the animal was eaten by the worshippers and a portion given to the priest, the fat was burnt on the altar and the blood was sprinkled on it.

Table 20. Instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the post-300 BC literary sources.

Other contexts: Gods			
Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγισμοί	Jahve	Joseph. <i>Bj</i> 1.32	1st century AD
ἐναγισμοί	Jahve	Joseph. <i>Bj</i> 1.39	1st century AD
ἐναγισμοί	Jahve	Joseph. <i>Bj</i> 1.148	1st century AD
ἐναγισμοί	Jahve	Joseph. <i>Bj</i> 6.98	1st century AD
ἐναγιζαν	Osiris	Plut. <i>De Is. et Os.</i> 359b	1st–2nd century AD
ἐναγιζαν	Gods of Egypt	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 1.28.1	3rd century AD
ἐναγιζαν	Gods of Egypt	Heliod. <i>Aeth.</i> 10.16.7	3rd century AD
ἐναγισμοῦ	Christian God	Synesios <i>Hymn.</i> 6.27	4th–5th century AD

A similar use of *enagizein* is also found in Porphyrios' *Philosophy from oracles*.

The text divides the gods into four categories: *hypochthonioi*, *epichthonioi*, *thalassioi* and *ouranioi*, to all of whom the worshipper is encouraged to θυσίας ἐναγίζων. The text is full of ritual detail and terminology which partly deviate from the common usage found in earlier sources, but it is clear that, at the sacrifices to the first three categories of gods, the victims were to be destroyed, either by burying, by burning or by throwing them into the sea. At the sacrifices to the *ouranioi theoi*, the animals are eaten, and the ritual has many of the characteristics of a regular *thysia*. Since *thysias enagizein* is used for all the sacrifices, the terms seem here to be used as a general expression for “to sacrifice” without any inherent meanings of holocausts or of particular recipients.

193

A certain confusion in the use of the terms can also be noted in some cases in which *enagizein* is used for sacrifices to gods, however, mainly in the sources of later date. Markellos speaks about the rituals concerning the children of Medea at Corinth.

397

When the Corinthians *enagizontas* a black goat, the knife is missing, but the goat finds it with its hoof and the animal is subsequently sacrificed to Hera Akraia (αὐτῇ τυθῆναι). If the text is read straight off, it means that Hera received an *enagizein* sacrifice. It is possible that *enagizein* here should be considered as being used as a general term for holocaustic sacrifice.

398

However, it is also possible that Markellos, or rather Eusebios, who quotes Markellos, was confused as to who was the recipient of the *enagizein* sacrifice, since, when this particular ritual is mentioned in other sources, it is the dead children of Medea, and not Hera, who are given the *enagizein* sacrifices.

399

Similarly, Aelius Aristides speaks of the gods as the *euergetai* of the world, since they both created it and preserved it, and says that they prefer being greeted as *euergetai* rather than by being given great outlays of *enagismata* (πολυτελείας ἐναγισμάτων).

400

That these gods, who show no particular connection with the underworld, should be given *enagismata* seems puzzling. The transmission of *enagismata* was perhaps a mistake and the original

text may have read δῆ τισι θυσιῶν instead, as is found in one manuscript.

401

It would make more sense if the gods who created and ruled the world were given *thysiai* rather than *enagismata* as their main sacrifice.

194

On the whole, the *enagizein* sacrifices performed to gods were not of the kind in which any dining took place, either in the cases in which the recipients are connected with death and the underworld or when the terms are used in the general sense of burning.

402

The ritual consisted in a complete destruction of the offerings, usually by fire.

403

In some instances, the sacrifices are remarked upon as involving great expense, perhaps a further indication that the offerings were completely destroyed.

404

In a few cases, the ritual was instead focused on the blood of the victim. Heliodoros uses *enagizein* for a pre-battle sacrifice, at which the animal was bled and left on the spot, without any burning taking place.

405

The *enagizein* sacrifice purifying Lemnos cannot have involved any burning, since all fire on the island was extinguished during this period and new fire was later brought from Delos.

406

This ritual may have consisted in a purification accomplished by blood.

407

3.2.3. *Enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the explicatory sources

195

Enagizein, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are found in a substantial number of explicatory sources, both as terms being explained and as being used in the explanations of other terms and concepts. The terms are mainly connected with sacrifices to the ordinary dead and are less frequently used for sacrifices to the heroes. There is also a handful of cases in which the recipients are gods (Table 21).

The context and usage of the terms for sacrifices to the ordinary dead and to the gods in the explicatory sources are similar to those found in the post-300 BC sources. *Enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are used both for the rituals performed at the burial and for the offerings made at the graves to the ordinary dead.

408

In one instance, *enagismata* is used as a reference to the Anthesteria.

409

Of the gods receiving *enagizein* sacrifices, some have a connection with the underworld, since they are specified as *katachthonioi*.

410

197

In other cases, *enagismata* is used for sacrifices to gods in the sense of a total burning of the offering no matter who was the recipient. In a scholion on the *Iliad*, the *mera*, the thigh-bones burnt as the gods' portion at a *thysia*, are explained as the *enagismata* for the gods.

411

A similar use of *enagismata* as the burnt part of a *thysia* is perhaps intended in a scholion on Pindar, speaking of the *thysiai* and *enagismata* filling up the area around the altars of Zeus at Olympia.

412

Table 21. Instances of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the explicatory literary sources.

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναιγίλειν	The dead and the subterranean gods	Erat. <i>Vox. Hitt.</i> 74.80	1st century AD
ἐναιγίλειν ἐναιγίσματα	The dead	Poll. <i>Onom.</i> 3.102 (Bethe 1900–31)	2nd century AD
ἐναιγίσματα	Harmodios	Poll. <i>Onom.</i> 8.91 (Bethe 1900–31)	2nd century AD
ἐναιγίσματα	The dead	Poll. <i>Onom.</i> 8.146 (Bethe 1900–31)	2nd century AD
ἐναιγίσματα	The dead	Hsch. s.v. αἰμακορπία (Late 1953–65, A 1939)	5th century AD
ἐναιγίλειν	The dead	Hsch. s.v. ἀπορρόδες (Late 1953–65, A 6792)	5th century AD
ἐναιγίλειν	The dead	Hsch. s.v. ἐγγρομαρία (Late 1953–65, E 146)	5th century AD
ἐναιγίλειν	The dead	Hsch. s.v. ἐναιγίλειν (Late 1953–65, E 2506)	5th century AD
ἐναιγίσματα	—	Hsch. s.v. ἐναιγίσματα (Late 1953–65, E 2587)	5th century AD
ἐναιγισμοί	—	Hsch. s.v. ἐναιγισμοί (Late 1953–65, E 2506)	5th century AD
ἐναιγίλειν	Heroes	Hsch. s.v. ἐναιγίλειν (Late 1953–65, E 3946)	5th century AD
ἐναιγισμός	—	Hsch. s.v. θεοσκόπος (Late 1953–65, D 497)	5th century AD
ἐναιγίλειν	The dead	Hsch. s.v. καὶ μὲν βίη καὶ θάνατος θεοτάτα (Late 1953–65, M 1210)	5th century AD
ἐναιγίλειν	Children of Medea	Phot. <i>Lex.</i> s.v. αἰγὶς τρέπον (Theodoridis 1982–98, A 532)	9th century AD

Table 21 (continued)

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίσματα	—	Phot. <i>Lex.</i> s.v. ἐναγίσματα (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 792)	9th century AD
ἐναγίσματα	The dead	Phot. <i>Lex.</i> s.v. ἐναγίσματα (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 793)	9th century AD
ἐναγίλιν	—	Phot. <i>Lex.</i> s.v. ἐναγίλιν (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 794)	9th century AD
ἐναγισμοί	—	Phot. <i>Lex.</i> s.v. ἐναγισμοί (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 795)	9th century AD
ἐναγίσματα	The dead	<i>Suda</i> s.v. ἀπαργμάτων ὧρων καιρώτερον (Adler 1928–35, A 2921)	10th century AD
ἐναγίσματα	The dead	<i>Suda</i> s.v. ἀπορράδες ἡμέραι (Adler 1928–35, A 3642)	10th century AD
ἐναγίλιν	The dead	<i>Suda</i> s.v. ἐναγίλιν (Adler 1928–35, E 1092)	10th century AD
ἐναγίλιν	Xanthos	<i>Suda</i> s.v. ἐναγίλιν (Adler 1928–35, E 1093)	10th century AD
ἐναγισμοί	The dead	<i>Suda</i> s.v. ἐναγισμοί (Adler 1928–35, E 1094)	10th century AD
ἐναγίσματα	The dead	<i>Suda</i> s.v. χοός (Adler 1928–35, X 364)	10th century AD
ἐναγίλιν	The dead	<i>Erym. Magn.</i> s.v. ἐναγίλιν (Gaisford 1848)	12th century AD
ἐναγίσματα	—	<i>Erym. Magn.</i> s.v. χύτλα (Gaisford 1848)	12th century AD
ἐναγίλιν	The dead	Schol. ad Aesch. <i>Cho.</i> 23b (Smith 1976)	—
ἐναγισμοί	The dead	Schol. ad Aesch. <i>Cho.</i> 484c (Smith 1976)	—
ἐναγίλιν	Aischylos	Schol. ad Aesch. <i>PV, Vita Aeschyl.</i> 11 (Herington 1972)	—
ἐναγίσματα	Gods	Schol. ad Aesch. <i>Supp.</i> 122 (Smith 1976)	—
ἐναγίλιν	The dead	Schol. ad Ap. Rhod. <i>Argon.</i> 1.587 (Wendel 1935)	—
ἐναγίσματα	—	Schol. ad Ap. Rhod. <i>Argon.</i> 1.1075–77a (Wendel 1935)	—
ἐναγίσματα	The dead	Schol. ad Ar. <i>Ach.</i> 961 (Pfister 1909–12, 473)	—
ἐναγίλιν	Themistokles	Schol. ad Ar. <i>Eq.</i> 84b (Jones & Wilson 1969, vet.)	—
ἐναγίλιν	The dead	Schol. ad Ar. <i>Ran.</i> 293 (Koster 1962)	—
ἐναγίλιν	Polyeidos and his children	Schol. ad Dion. Byz. <i>Bosp.</i> 19 (Wescher 1874)	—
ἐναγίλιν	Those going down	Schol. ad Eur. <i>Phoen.</i> 274 (Schwartz 1887)	—

Table 21 (continued)

Term	Recipient	Source	Date
ἐναγίζματα	The gods	Schol. ad Hom. <i>Il.</i> 1.464 b ¹ & b ² (Erbse 1969–00, vol. 1)	–
ἐναγίζειν	–	Schol. ad Hom. <i>Il.</i> 3.273b (Erbse 1969–88, vol. 1)	–
ἐναγισμοί	?	Schol. ad Hom. <i>Il.</i> 23.75–76 (Erbse 1969–88, vol. 5)	–
ἐναγίζματα	The dead	Schol. ad Hom. <i>Od.</i> 1.291 (Dindorf 1855)	–
ἐναγίζματα	The dead	Schol. ad Lucian <i>Catapl.</i> 2 (Rabe 1906)	–
ἐναγίζειν	The subterranean gods	Schol. ad Lucian <i>Tim.</i> 43 (Rabe 1906)	–
ἐναγίζματα	The dead	Schol. ad Nic. <i>Theor.</i> 860a (Crugnola 1971)	–
ἐναγίζματα	The dead	Schol. ad Pind. <i>Ol.</i> 1.146a (Drachmann 1903–27)	–
ἐναγισμοί	Pelops	Schol. ad Pind. <i>Ol.</i> 1.146b (Drachmann 1903–27)	–
ἐναγισμοί	Pelops	Schol. ad Pind. <i>Ol.</i> 1.146d (Drachmann 1903–27)	–
ἐναγίζματα	Pelops	Schol. ad Pind. <i>Ol.</i> 1.150a (Drachmann 1903–27)	–
ἐναγίζματα	Zeus	Schol. ad Pind. <i>Ol.</i> 3.335 (Drachmann 1903–27)	–
ἐναγίζματα	Zeus	Schol. ad Pind. <i>Ol.</i> 3.334d (Drachmann 1903–27)	–
ἐναγίζματα	Antenoridae	Schol. ad Pind. <i>Pyth.</i> 5.113b (Drachmann 1903–27)	–
ἐναγισμοί	The heroes at Delphi	Schol. ad Pind. <i>Nem.</i> 7.62c (Drachmann 1903–27)	–
ἐναγίζειν	Childrer. of Herakles and Megara	Schol. ad Pind. <i>Isthm.</i> 4.104b (Drachmann 1903–27)	–
ἐναγίζματα	–	Schol. ad Thuc. 3.58.4 (Hude 1927)	–
ἐναγίζειν ἐναγίζματα	–	Schol. ad Thuc. 5.11.1 (Hude 1927)	–

198

Some of the heroes connected with *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the explicatory sources can be fitted into the pattern of use of these terms outlined previously. In some cases, the explicatory sources simply quote an earlier source, mentioning a hero receiving *enagizein* sacrifices, or refer to an earlier tradition of such rituals in a particular hero-cult.

413

In other cases, the *enagizein* sacrifices were performed at the grave of the hero (Aischylos and Themistokles).

414

Themistokles is also said to have died a violent death, committing suicide by drinking the blood of a bull.

415

199

It is interesting to note the use of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* by

the scholia to explain sacrifices to heroes mentioned in earlier sources, such as Pindar, Thucydides and Apollonios Rhodios. These earlier authors never use these terms, either for sacrifices to heroes or for the rituals performed to the ordinary dead.

416

In some instances, the rituals explained in the scholia are more or less the same or at least are related to the actions covered by *enagizein*. For example, the *haimakouriai* given to Pelops at Olympia, mentioned by Pindar, are explained in the scholia as a Boiotian term for *enagismata* to the dead and *enagismoι* of blood.

417

The sacrifices to Brasidas at Amphipolis are described by Thucydides by the term ὡς ἥρω ἐντέμνειν and θυσίαι, while the scholion explains *entemnein* as “*enagizein*, bringing of *enagismata*, *thyein*”.

418

In the *Argonautica*, Apollonios Rhodios speaks of ἔντομα μῆλων κείαν at the tomb of Dolops: *entoma* is explained by the scholiast as *sphagia* and the *enagizomena* to the dead.

419

The *esthemata* (clothes) offered annually to the war dead at Plataiai, according to Thucydides, are glossed as *enagismata* and can also be related to the sphere of funerary offerings.

420

200

In other cases, the rituals explained seem to have had a content which was not at all related to that of *enagizein* sacrifices. The preparation of *bomoi* and burnt-animal sacrifice (*empyra*), filling the air with *knise* to the children of Herakles and Megara at Thebes, described in Pindar's fourth *Isthmian Ode*, are promptly summarized by the term *enagizein* by the scholiast.

421

In the fifth *Pythian Ode*, Pindar describes how Battos and his men welcomed the Antenoridai at Kyrene with *thysiai* and brought them gifts (δέκονται θυσίαισιν ... οἰχνέοντές σφε δωροφόροι).

422

In the scholion, it is stated that the children of Antenor were honoured with *thysiai* and received gifts and *enagismata*.

423

The heroes of Delphi were honoured with processions and many sacrifices (*polythytoi*), according to Pindar: the scholiast describes the

rituals as *thysiai* followed by *enagismoi*.

424

In these cases, it seems as if the scholiasts automatically assumed that *enagizein* sacrifices formed a part of the rituals to all heroes, whether the actual sources they were commenting upon indicated such sacrifices or not. It is possible that the increased use of *enagizein* for sacrifices to heroes in the Roman period may have led to the assumption by some scholiasts that this kind of ritual was standard in the cult of heroes, also in the Classical and the Hellenistic periods. Therefore, in commenting upon the sacrifices to heroes, the scholiasts use *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* as an explanation both of rituals that could form part of *enagizein* sacrifices or could be equated with such sacrifices and of rituals that seem to have been *thysiai* followed by dining.

201

Finally, the meanings of the terms, as regards concrete actions, should be considered. In the explicatory sources, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are linked both to different kinds of libations and to a total burning of the offerings. In the case of *enagizein*, the sources offer a series of explanations: to bring *choai*, to sacrifice to the dead (θύειν τοῖς κατοιχομένοις), to destroy completely by burning (διὰ πυρός δαπανᾶν or κατακαίειν) or to kill (φονεύειν).

425

202

A specific explanation as libations is given in several cases. A scholion on Aristophanes states that *choai* are the *enagismata* for the dead or *spondai*.

426

The lexicon by Photios explains *enagismata* as *choai* and *enagizein* as to perform *choai*.

427

In the scholia on Pindar's seventh *Nemean Ode*, *enagismoi* are being poured out.

428

The *Etymologicum Magnum* and a scholion on Apollonios Rhodios state that *enagismata* and *choai* were incorrectly used for a mixture of water and olive oil, called *chytla*.

429

The contents of the libations are not specified in these cases, but the

scholia on Pindar explain *haimakouriai* as *enagismoι* of blood, given to the dead, and Hesychios equates *haimakouriai* with *enagismata* to the dead.

430

In the scholia on Apollonios Rhodios, the term *entoma* is defined as *sphagia* and *ta enagizomena* to the dead.

431

The *enagizein* sacrifice into a *bothros*, mentioned in the scholia on Euripides, can also be taken as a connection between this term and offerings of blood.

432

203

In other sources, the terms are explained as meaning that the offerings were burnt. *Enagismata* and *enagismoι* are explained as *holokautomata* by Hesychios, Photios and Suda.

433

In the scholia on the *Iliad*, *enagismata* is used to explain the term *mera* (the thigh-bones burnt in the altar fire).

434

A scholiast on the *Libation Bearers* by Aischylos uses *enagismoι* to clarify the *empyra knisota* (steaming, burnt sacrifices) offered to the dead.

435

204

There is no indication in the explicatory sources that the terms are connected with sacrifices involving any kind of dining.

436

Apart from referring to the burning of offerings and the pouring of libations, the terms are also used for sacrifices differing from regular *thysiai*, as regards both the context and the ritual detail. In a scholion on the *Iliad*, commenting upon an oath sacrifice, it is said that no hair was thrown into the fire from the victims used at *enagizein* sacrifices, indicating a ritual different from the one at a *thysia*.

437

The explicatory sources also connect *enagizein* with pollution, by explaining *agos* as *miasma*, and with purifications, by giving *enagismata* as an alternative to *katharmata*, the offscourings from purificatory rituals.

438

3.3. Conclusion

205

The two principal conclusions reached in this review of *enagizein*, *enagisma*, *enagismos* and *enagisterion* concern the chronological spread of the terms as used for hero-cults, as well as the changes in use and meaning which the terms underwent in the course of time.

206

In the Classical and Hellenistic literary sources, the terms are used only for sacrifices to the ordinary dead and the heroes and are not very frequent. The earliest occurrence of *enagizein* and the related nouns in the epigraphical evidence dates to the late 2nd century BC. In the Roman period, the use of the terms for sacrifices to the ordinary dead is still not very common, but there is a pronounced increase in the use of *enagizein* and its related nouns for sacrifices in hero-cults, particularly in the 2nd century AD (see Table 22). The *hapax enagisterion* is only found in an late 2nd century AD inscription, for example.

Table 22. Chronological distribution of *enagizein*, *enagisma*, *enagismos* and *enagisterion* in Greek contexts for sacrifices to heroes and the ordinary dead in the epigraphical and literary sources (explicatory sources not included).

Date	Heroes		The dead		Total	
	Inscr.	Lit. texts	Inscr.	Lit. texts	Inscr.	Lit. texts
5th century BC	—	2	—	—	—	2
5th–4th century BC	—	—	—	5	—	5
4th century BC	—	2	—	2	—	4
4th–3rd century BC	—	—	—	2	—	2
3rd century BC	—	2	—	—	—	2
3rd–2nd century BC	1	1	1	—	2	1
1st century BC	1	2	—	—	1	2
1st century BC to 1st century AD	1	5	—	—	1	5
1st–2nd century AD	—	12	1	2	1	14
2nd century AD	1	29	—	6	1	35
2nd–3rd century AD	—	12	—	3	—	15
3rd century AD	—	7	—	5	—	12
3rd–4th century AD	—	—	—	1	—	1
4th century AD	—	2	1	4	1	6
4th–5th century AD	1	—	—	—	1	—
Total	5	76	3	30	8	106

Is this increase in the use of these terms to be taken as a reflection of *enagizein* sacrifices having become more common in Roman times as compared with earlier periods or as the terms now being used in a more general manner, not necessarily corresponding to particular rituals and recipients, as was the case previously? The possibility that changes may have taken place both in the religious and the linguistic spheres has to be taken into consideration but, most of all, the use of *enagizein* and its related terms has to be put in relation to the aim and character of the sources in which the terms are found and the period when these texts were composed. The popularity of the terms in question is, in fact, almost exclusively the result of their frequent use in four sources: Pausanias, Plutarch, Philostratos and Heliodoros. These writers can all be said both to reflect and to be influenced by the antiquarian tendencies of the age in which they were active, i.e., the 1st to the 3rd centuries AD. Among the trends of this period was a fascination for the past, which led to a greater interest in the religion of old times.

439

Old cults were revived or boosted and new ones with a connection with the past were instituted.

In this period, *enagizein* sacrifices may have been considered as an old and venerable ritual and as a sign of hero-cults that had a long history. In several instances, the writers comment upon the age of the cults in question. This is most obvious in Pausanias, who uses the terms more frequently than any other ancient source. In ten cases out of 25, he remarks that the *enagizein* sacrifices were “still carried out” or performed “even in my day”.

440

Also Plutarch comments that the sacrifices to Konnidas in Athens and to the war dead at Plataiai were performed to this very day, the latter even said to be the same kinds of rituals as those instituted in the 5th century BC.

441

Philostratos reports that the *enagizein* sacrifices to Achilles at Troy, performed by the Thessalians, were considered as originating from the time of the tyrants.

442

Other sources from the same period make similar comments, for example, the sacrifices to Hippokrates on Kos being described as still carried out in the 2nd century AD, the *enagizein* sacrifices to the children of Medea being performed μέχρι τοῦ νῦν by the Corinthians and the *enagizein* sacrifices to the war dead at Megara carried out [μ]εχρις ἐφ' ἡμῶν (up to our own day).

443

209

The reason for considering *enagizein* sacrifices as old cult practices in the Hellenistic and Roman times may have been that they differed from the rituals used in the new hero-cults established in these periods. The sacrifices used in these cults, as well as in the ruler and imperial cults, were of the *thysia* kind.

444

Dining formed an important part of the ritual and, by having a large number of citizens participating in the meal, the recipient of the cult, as well as his relatives, gained in prestige. Since *enagizein* sacrifices were especially connected with recipients who were dead and seem to have functioned as a marker of the recipient's "dead-ness", they were not suitable sacrifices for the ruler and imperial cults which aimed at disguising the mortality of the recipient.

445

This difference in the kind of rituals performed may have been taken as the *enagizein* sacrifices being a mark of an ancient and venerable hero-cult, distinct from contemporaneous practices. As such, they attracted the attention of the writers with an interest in antiquarian matters.

210

Enagizein sacrifices as a sign of an old cult may perhaps also be the explanation for a certain increase in the course of time in the use of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* for sacrifices to the war dead, an increase which, to some extent, may reflect a change in cult practices. In the Classical period, sacrifices of this kind do not seem to have been practised in the cult of the war dead or, at least, they are not mentioned in the available sources.

446

In the Hellenistic period, the terms are used for the sacrifices to the war dead of earlier periods, even though these heroes do not seem to have received *enagizein* sacrifices previously. In his critical

commentary on Thucydides, Dionysios of Halikarnassos explicitly blames the earlier historian for not mentioning the *enagismoi* to the Greeks killed in the war in Sicily in 414/3.

447

Thucydides himself, however, never uses this term. The *enagizein* sacrifices to the Marathonian war dead, mentioned in a late-2nd-century BC inscription, do not seem to have been a continuous tradition from the Classical period and may have been a new feature of this period.

448

Also the sacrifices to the Megarian war dead, which, in the 4th century AD, were designated by *enagizein*, may have been a kind of ritual that had not been practised previously.

449

Similarly, Plutarch describes the *enagizein* sacrifices to the war dead at Plataiai. For these sacrifices we actually have more evidence as to their content in earlier periods and it seems clear that there had been changes in the cult practices from the 5th century BC down to Plutarch's time.

450

211

Why this change took place is hard to say but one suggestion is that the link between *enagizein* sacrifices and the war dead could be seen as an attempt to evoke the glorious past of the independent poleis that did not exist any longer. Festivals with a historical focus, particularly those commemorating the military glory of earlier times, became increasingly popular in the Hellenistic and the Roman periods.

451

The cult of the war dead served as a reminder of the past and the use of *enagizein* sacrifices may have functioned as a way of marking their ancient character and distinguishing them from the more recent heroes of the Hellenistic and the Roman periods.

212

In the case of the war dead, a change in cult practice may have taken place, but the evidence is too scant for any certainty. Other cults containing *enagizein* sacrifices show evidence of having been re-organized, newly installed or even created in the Hellenistic or Roman periods.

A particularly interesting case is the *enagisterion* used for the cult of Palaimon at Isthmia, which seems to be, in fact, the only osteologically demonstrated case of a holocaust to a Greek hero. This cult place was clearly a Roman establishment and need not have had any connections in ritual with a Classical cult of the hero on the same site.

If *enagizein* sacrifices were considered as a sign of venerable age, this kind of ritual practice may have been consciously chosen for these very reasons, even though the sacrifices to Palaimon in the Archaic and Classical periods may have been of another kind. It is also possible that contemporary Roman demands and taste may have affected the ritual practices of some hero-cults (as well as other cults) but this is a matter that requires further investigation.

Such considerations have to be taken into account when deciding to what extent the mentions of *enagizein* sacrifices in the Roman sources have any bearing on the cult practices of earlier periods, for which *enagizein* and its related terms are rare. Many of these cults are remarked upon as being old, but are we to assume that the same kinds of rituals were performed also in the Classical period, for example? Since there is, in most cases, no earlier evidence to compare with, the question becomes one of methodology, i.e., whether later sources can be used to throw light on earlier periods, which brings us back to the initial comments on the 1st- to 3rd-century AD sources reflecting the attitudes of their own time. In some instances in which more information is available, the war dead at Plataiai, for example, it is clear that the practices reported by the Roman sources cannot be considered valid also for earlier periods. In all, even though it is theoretically possible that these later sources reporting *enagizein* sacrifices may describe rituals also performed as early as the Classical period, the information on these sacrifices in the Roman sources is best used with care when applied to conditions of earlier periods considering the many uncertain factors.

The occurrence of *enagizein* and the corresponding nouns in the Roman period may thus, to a certain extent, correspond to an

increase of certain rituals that were less common during earlier periods. At the same time, it has to be kept in mind that the bulk of the evidence for *enagizein* sacrifices is found in Pausanias, who deliberately picked out matters worthy of reporting. It is possible that his frequent use of *enagizein* is a result of these sacrifices being interesting and spectacular rather than an indication of this kind of ritual being more or less the standard practice of hero-cults of his time.

455

In fact, Pausanias mentions almost as many sacrifices to heroes covered by *thyein* or *thysia* as sacrifices covered by *enagizein* or *enagismos*.

456

On the whole, *enagizein* sacrifices may still have been relatively rare in the Roman period, as compared to *thysia* sacrifices, but this is an assumption, which can only be verified or falsified by a wider investigation of hero-cults in this period.

215

There is no reason to assume, on the other hand, that the popularity of *enagizein* and the related terms is due to their being used in a more general sense for hero-cults in these sources, even though signs of a gradual change in use and meaning can be noted in the 3rd and 4th centuries AD (see below, p. 127). Pausanias, for example, makes the same distinctions between *enagizein* sacrifices and *thysiai* as do the sources of earlier periods.

457

The detailed descriptions of the rituals for the war dead at Plataiai by Plutarch and in the cult of Achilles at Troy in Philostratos' *Heroicus* leave no doubt that the sacrifices performed were of a kind entirely different from *thysiai*.

216

In any case, the frequent use of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* for the sacrifices to heroes in the Roman period, no matter how it is to be explained, may be the reason for the link between *enagizein* and hero-cults made in the scholia. These sources use *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* almost as generic explanations of any kind of sacrifices to heroes mentioned in earlier sources, whether these earlier rituals corresponded to the content of *enagizein* sacrifices or not.

217

enagizein, *enagisma* and *enagismos* started off in the Classical period as terms used for sacrifices to dead recipients, both heroes and the ordinary dead. The heroes receiving this kind of sacrifice seem to have had a particular connection with death. From the contexts in which these sacrifices are found, it is clear that the fact that they were dead and had died was considered important. The burial and the grave could figure prominently in the cult and many of these heroes had died in a violent way, being killed in war, murdered or having committed suicide. Sometimes, the manner of death led to grave consequences and the *enagizein* sacrifices were aimed at placating the heroes' anger. These particular characteristics can be traced from the earliest cases in which *enagizein* sacrifices are used for heroes (5th century) all through the Roman period.

218

The connection between *enagizein* sacrifices and death is further underlined by the many contexts in which these sacrifices are contrasted with the cult of an immortal recipient. A hero receiving *enagizein* sacrifices may be worshipped in connection with an immortal god or be buried in the god's precinct. This contrast between mortality and immortality can also be found in the same recipient. The earliest and clearest case is the dual cult of Herakles, who received both *enagizein* sacrifices as a hero and *thyein* sacrifices as an immortal god, a ritual combination which is explicitly commented upon by sources from the Classical, the Hellenistic and the Roman periods alike.

458

Because of his dual character and dual cult, Herakles occupies a unique position among the heroes. The only parallel to Herakles in this aspect is Achilles and it is interesting to note that they both seem to have been principally regarded as gods.

459

In the case of Herakles, and probably also Achilles, the use of both kinds of rituals seems to mark the fact that the recipient was originally a mortal hero who was later promoted to become an immortal god

460

The *enagizein* sacrifices served as a reminder of the recipient's origin, an origin that he seems to have more or less transgressed in the course of time.

In the Roman period, the usage and meaning of the terms underwent some important changes regarding both the recipients of the sacrifices and the contents of the rituals. The pronounced connection between *enagizein* and death seems to have diminished gradually. First of all, *enagizein* and the two nouns began to be used also for sacrifices to gods, though gods with a connection with the underworld. The *enagizein* sacrifices to these gods differed from *thysia* sacrifices regarding both their aim and their ritual content, since they were concerned with, for example, purification, expiation, pre-battle sacrifice and human sacrifice. Secondly, the terms came to mean a total burning of the offerings without any particular bearing on the character of the recipient or the context in which the sacrifice was performed. The recipient did not have to be dead or to have a connection with death and the sacrifice did not necessarily differ from a *thysia*. In this particular, late use of *enagizein*, the actual burning and creation of fragrant smoke was of essential importance and therefore *enagizein* seems to be used in almost the same sense as *thyein*.

220

Apart from this late and rare usage, *enagizein* and its connected nouns were used for sacrifices at which the offerings were destroyed and the participants did not dine, in contrast to *thysia* sacrifices. The difference between *enagizein* sacrifices and *thysiai* does not concern only the fact that the recipients of the former kind of sacrifice had a particular connection with death. A further sign of the distinction is the use of *enagizein* for contexts differing from the *thysiai*, such as rituals of purification, pre-battle sacrifices and human sacrifices. This use is, however, mainly documented in the Roman period.

221

What was sacrificed at the *enagizein* sacrifices is often not specified.

461

When the terms are used for sacrifices to heroes, the offerings seem to have consisted of animal victims: bulls, oxen, sheep, rams, lambs and goats. In contexts concerning sacrifices to the ordinary dead, the terms could refer to the whole ritual performed at the tomb or, more specifically, the non-fluid offerings, consisting of cakes, fruit and prepared food.

222

The animal victims at *enagizein* sacrifices were totally abandoned by the worshippers. This could mean that the carcass was left at the site of the sacrifice or, more commonly, that it was destroyed by burning. The importance of fire in the *enagizein* sacrifices is clear from the use of the terms to cover rituals in non-Greek contexts, at which the offerings were completely annihilated by fire and from the extended meaning of the terms in the late Roman period as general terms for burning.

223

A particular connection with blood and the use of *enagizein* and the two nouns for a sacrifice consisting of blood is mainly found in the late Roman and the explicatory sources. An *enagizein* sacrifice of an animal victim may have included a particular treatment of the blood, for example, a total discarding of the blood on a specific place, an action which could have initiated the ritual. However, since the meat was not available for consumption, the basic meaning of the terms must have been as a destruction sacrifice involving a whole animal victim. The particular handling of the blood is rather indicated by the use of a separate term.

224

The link with libations is less clear when the terms are used for herocults. In funerary cults, the terms *enagisma* and *enagismos* could refer to libations, but the rituals at the grave could also be divided into *enagizein* and the pouring of *choai*. It is mainly the explicatory sources that explain the terms as libations.

Notes

1 For previous studies, see, for example, Pfister 1909–12, 475–476; Stengel 1920, 15–17; Rudhardt 1958, 250–251.

2 Casabona 1966, 204–210; Rudhardt 1958, 238–239 and 250–251; Pfister 1909–12, 466–480; cf. Robert F. 1939, 156–160 and 178–179.

3 *Entemnein* and related terms: Casabona 1966, 211–229; Rudhardt 1958, 281–286; Stengel 1910, 103–104. *Sphazein* and related terms: Casabona 1966, 155–196;

Rudhardt 1958, 272–281; Stengel 1910, 92–102. *Holokautein*: Rudhardt 1958, 286–287. *Choai*: Casabona 1966, 279–297; Rudhardt 1958, 246–248; Stengel 1910, 183–185; Citron 1965, 69–70.

4 Benveniste 1954, 251; Casabona 1966, vi; Rudhardt 1958, 3–8; Peirce 1993, 219–266.
5 Casabona 1966, 348.

6 The date of the sources used by Pfister (1909–12, 475–476), Stengel (1920, 15–16), Rohde (1925, 23 and 50, n. 53), Rudhardt (1958, 250–251) and Burkert (1985, 199 and 428, n. 4) to define *eschara* as a low and hollow altar particular for hero-cults may serve as an example.

7 Harpokration and Pollux date from the 2nd century AD. For the dates of these sources, see *OCD3* s.vv. *etymologica*, *glossa*, Harpokration, Pollux, Hesychius, Photius, *Suda*, Eustathius, *Lexica Segueriana*.

8 On the difficulties of dating scholia, see Smith 1981; Erbse 1965, 2723–2725; McNamee 1995; Dear 1931; *OCD3* s.v. *scholia*.

9 *LSJ* s.v. ἐσχάρα. There are some variants, which have partly the same meaning (cf. *LSJ* for references): ἐσχάρων (diminutive of *eschara*), ἐσχάρις (brazier) and its diminutive ἐσχάριδίον.

10 *Eschara* also seems to be a type of fish (sole?) or sea-food; see Archippos fr. 24 (*PCG* II, 1991), 5th century BC.

11 *LSJ*, Second supplement (1996), s.v. ἐσχάρα; cf. Chadwick 1986; Chadwick 1996, 111–115.

12 Chadwick 1986, 515–523, finds that the meanings diverge widely with no obvious link between them. He argues that the original sense of the word was “fire-place”, which was later extended to include the fire-basket, when such a construction had come into use. After this development, *eschara* came to be distinct from the hearth, designated by *hestia*.

13 Ar. Av. 1232.

14 Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 5.9.7.

15 Arist. [Pr.] 863a; cf. the English term “eschar”.

16 Hippoc. *Art.* 11.30 and 70; Plato fr. 200, line 4 (*PCG* VII, 1989).

17 Theophr. *Hist. pl.* 5.9.7.

18 Ammonios *FGrHist* 361 F 1b. The form *escharios* can refer to the construction surrounding a boat, when it is lowered into the water (Ath. 5.204c). This latter term can also mean “platform” (Diod. Sic. 20.91.2). The connection between *eschara* and wooden constructions will be further discussed below in the section on the epigraphical evidence.

19 For example, Hippocrates and the *Corpus Hippocraticum* (*Art.* 11.30, 11.40, 11.60 and 11.70; cf. Kühn & Fleischer 1989, s.v. ἐσχάρη) and predominantly in Roman or later medical sources, such as Dioscorides Pedanius (1st century AD), Galenos, Pseudo-Galenos and Aretaios (2nd century AD), Aëtios and Nonnos (6th century AD), Paulos (7th century AD) and the *Hippiatrica* (9th century AD); cf. Durling 1993, s.v. ἐσχάρα and related terms. The non-medical use is generally rare.

20 Deneken 1886–90, 2496–2501; Pfister 1909–12, 475–476; Foucart 1918, 97; Stengel 1920, 15; Rohde 1925, 23; Robert F. 1939, 185–187; Rudhardt 1958, 129; Nilsson 1967, 78; Burkert 1985, 199; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41.

21 Deneken 1886–90, 2496–2501; Pfister 1909–12, 474–476; Stengel 1920, 15–16; Rohde 1925, 23; Robert F. 1939, 185–189; Yavis 1949, 93–94; Rudhardt 1958, 238–239 and 250–251; Nilsson 1967, 78; Burkert 1985, 199; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41.

22 Stengel 1920, 15–16; Rohde 1925, 23.

23 Deneken 1886–90, 2498–2501; Pfister 1909–12, 476; Stengel 1920, 16.

24 Reisch 1907, 614–617; Stengel 1920, 15–16; Robert F. 1939, 185–189; Nilsson 1967, 78.

25 Van Straten 1974, 174 and 185–187; van Straten 1995, 165–167; Reisch, 1907, 616; Stengel 1920, 16.

26 The literary definitions of *eschara* have been used to identify them in the archaeological and iconographical material. I have dealt with parts of that evidence elsewhere (Ekroth 1998 and Ekroth 2001) and I hope to treat it more fully in the future. For the iconographical material, see also van Straten 1974 and van Straten 1995, 165–167.

27 The terms *escharidion*, *escharion* and *escharis* are also found in the inscriptions, but the meaning seems to be confined to small censers or incense-burners (see Hellmann 1992, 73).

28 For example, the sacrifice by Eumaïos on the household hearth in *Od.* 14.420.

29 *Escharai* of bronze, 4th century: *IG* II² 120, 46; 1414, 41; 1416, 8; 1424a, 260; 1425, 364; 1440, 53; 1640, 33–34; *ID* 104–12, 115–116; probably also *IG* II² 1638, 59; 1639, 1; *ID* 104, 133; 104–10, 10; 3rd century: *IG* XI:2 161 B, 124; 199 B, 76; probably also *IG* XI:2 164 B, 12 and 36; 199 B, 89; 2nd century: *ID* 1416 A, col. I, 14; 1417 B, col. I, 11; 1442 A, 81; 1452 A, 14; probably *ID* 439b, 16; 442 B, 173; 443 Bb, 96; 444 B, 11; 457, 22; 1400, 5; 1409 Bc, col. II, 28. *Eschara* of silver, 4th century: *IG* II² 1492, 70. *Escharai* of iron, 3rd century: *IG* XI:2 161 B, 128; 199 B, 79; 219 B, 74. The inventories from Brauron also mention *escharai* (see Peppas-Delmousou 1988, 336). These were probably simple braziers or grills, since they remained at Brauron, when the more valuable objects were moved to Athens. An *eschara* worth two obols (presumably a piece of household equipment made of terracotta) is mentioned in the Attic stelai, see Amyx 1958, 229–231, Stele III, line 9; Pritchett 1953, 262.

30 *IG* II² 1492, 70, *eschara* of silver. Cf. the silver *thymiaterion* or *escharis*, a votive gift by Boulomaga, mentioned in five Delian accounts from the 3rd century BC: *IG* XI:2 203 B, 44; 219 B, 52–53; 199 B, 16; 194, 4; *ID* 1401 a–b, 3–5.

31 Hellmann 1992, 77, interprets all the metal *escharai* in the Delos inscriptions as braziers or pans of coal.

32 *Escharai* occurring in a context with dining equipment: *IG* II² 1416, 8; 1638, 68; 1639, 1; 1640, 31 and 33–34; *ID* 104, 143; 104–10, 10; 104–11B, 35; 104–12, 114, all 4th century. In *ID* 461 Bb, 52 (2nd century), [*esch*]ara is probably wrongly restored (see Linders 1994, 76, n. 29).

33IG II² 1638, 68; 1639, 9; 1640, 31; ID 104, 142; 104-10, 10; 104-11B, 35; 104-12, 114; all 4th century; cf. the *μολυβδοκρατευταί*, lead frames on which a spit turns, mentioned by Poll. *Onom.* 10.96 (Bethe 1900-31). Chadwick (1986, 521), suggests that *autostrophos* possibly meant that the fire-basket was hinged so that the ashes could be tipped out without moving the base of the *eschara*.

34 Peek 1969, 48, no. 52, lines 15 and 16 = SEG 24, 1969, 277 (re-edition of IG IV² 118 A); for commentary, see Mitsos 1967, 15.

35IG XI:2 203 A, 33.

36ID 1417 A, col. I, 76 (156/5 BC) lists a *βωμὸν ξύλινον* among the inventories of the Thesmophorion, but it is perhaps best interpreted as meaning “wooden base” rather than an altar. However, Paus. 9.3.7 mentions that at the Daidala festival in Boiotia, a *bomos* was constructed of wooden blocks shaped and fitted together like stones. This altar was subsequently burnt.

37 Tréheux 1952, 564-566; Hellmann 1992, 73 and 77, with n. 22. For *eschara* or *escharis* as a sledge for the transportation of stones, see IG XI:2 203 B, 97 and IG II² 1673, 63, cf. discussion by Clinton 1971, 102; Raepsaet 1984; Orlandos 1968, 21, n. 15.

38IG II² 4977; Rhousopoulos 1862, 83, no. 84. The stone is 0.49 m high, 0.21 m wide and 0.07 m thick.

39 Cf. the two 4th-century stelai inscribed Ἀμφιαράο Ἀμφιλόχο and Ἰστίης placed against the smaller altar (5th century) in the Amphiareion at Oropos, IG VII 421; Leonardos 1917, 39-40, no. 91, figs. 1-2; Petrakos 1968, 67-68, 96-98, and pl. 19.

40 A small shrine found below the terrace of the Middle Stoa in the Athenian Agora was marked only by *horoi* before being fenced in (see Lalonde 1980, 97-105); cf. the four *horoi* of the Tritopatreion in the Kerameikos (Brückner 1910, 102-104; Kübler 1973, 189-193; Knigge 1974, 191-192).

41 Thorikos: Daux 1983, 153, line 36; for the reading Ἡρακλείδ[αις τέλεον], see Parker 1984, 59. Erchia: LS 18, col. II, 42-44. For the Herakleidae at Axione and elsewhere in Attica, see Kearns 1989, 166-167.

42LS 177 = Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 45; cf. Sherwin-White 1977, 210-213. The inscription falls into three parts of various dates: (1) lines 1-55, c. 325-300, (2) lines 56-68, c. 300 and (3) lines 69-159, c. 280 (see Sherwin-White 1977, 210, n. 21).

43 For *kyklon* (line 130) meaning “trencher”, cf. LSA 50, 32.

44 Farnell 1921, 122.

45 This aspect of the cult of Herakles is discussed by Verbanck-Piérard 1992, 85-106.

46 Jameson 1994a, esp. 42-43.

47 Blinkenberg 1941, 899-946, nos. 580-619; some examples were published in IG XII:1 791-804.

48 Blinkenberg 1941, 897-903, stated that among the finds was pottery dating from the PG period to the 7th century, a Cypriote limestone figurine and other figurines dating to the 6th century. A re-study of the pottery by Sørensen & Pentz 1992, 57, shows that only a few sherds can be safely dated to the PG or Geometric periods; cf.

Dyggve 1960, 462.

49 Blinkenberg 1941, *proscharaios thysia*: nos. 581, 582, 584–586, 592, 593, 595–597, 600, 601, 605–608 and 610–614.

50 Blinkenberg 1941, 908; cf. *SIG2* no. 626, n. 2.

51 Blinkenberg 1941, 907–909, *proscharaios thysia boukopia*: nos. 581, 585, 586, 600, 601, 606, 608, 610, 611 and 614; *proscharaios thysia theodaisia*: nos. 582, 584, 593, 595–597, 605, 607 and 613. A *thysia proscharaios ou boukopia* is also found, no. 612, as well as the combinations *proscharaios boukopia*, nos. 583, 599 and 602 and *proscharaios theodaisia*, no. 604. For *theodaisia*, related to *theoxenia*, and usually connected with Herakles and Dionysos, see Nilsson 1906, 279–280; Jameson 1994a, 36, n. 5.

52 Blinkenberg 1941, 904–906; Athena is mentioned in inscription no. 615 and possibly also in no. 616. Literary evidence for unburnt sacrifices to Athena of Rhodes: Pind. *Ol.* 7.40–49; Diod. Sic. 5.56.5–6; Philostr. *Imag.* 2.27.3. Dyggve 1960, 174–180, rejected Blinkenberg's theory, since ashes and animal bones were found on the acropolis.

53 Blinkenberg 1941, 907–908.

54 Blinkenberg drew parallels with *probomios* sacrifices, see *LSS* 115 A, lines 61, 67 and 68, and Eur. *Ion* 376. *Probomios* can refer both to a sacrifice in front of the altar and to a preliminary sacrifice; cf. *LSJ* s.v.

55 Kostomitsopoulos 1988, 122–128 = *SEG* 38, 1988, 788: Προ(σ)χάραιο(ς) Πρατάρχου θυσία οὐ βοκοπία; dated to c. 350 BC.

56 Kostomitsopoulos 1988, 125–126; *Suda* s.v. προσχαψητήρία and s.v. προχαρί,στήρία (Adler 1928–35, P2851 and 2928); cf. *Harp.* s.v. . προσχαψητήρία (Dindorf 1853). Kostomitsopoulos assigns the small shrine to Athena.

57 Deubner 1969, 17; Parker 1996, 303; cf. *Harp.* s.v. προσχαρητήρια (Dindorf 1853).

58 Reinmuth 1955, 228, line 15, supplementing *IG* II2 1032 (127/6 BC); *IG* II2 1006, 12–13 (123/2 BC); *IG* II2 1008, 15 (119/8 BC); *IG* II² 1011, 11 (107/6 BC).

59 4.18.16: τὸν ἐπ' ἐσχάρας ὑμνήσαι, κατ' ἔτος Διόνυσον (transl. by Benner & Fobes 1949).

60 Deubner 1969, 139–141; Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 59–61; Sourvinou-Inwood 1994, 270. Pélékidis 1962, 239–246, however, suggested that the procession took place at the Lenaia.

61 Mentioned by Paus. 1.29.2. For a proposed location of this shrine on the road to the Academy, see Clairmont 1983, 30 and fig. 1.

62 Deubner 1969, 141. Nilsson 1951, 212–213, argued that the *eisagoge* referred to the bringing of the god by the ephebes from his temple by the theatre into the orchestra. The sacrifices mentioned in *IG* II2 1006, 12, on the other hand, were performed in the sanctuary by the theatre in connection with the *pompe*.

63 Sourvinou-Inwood 1994, 281–285. Kolb 1981, 44, proposed that the altar in the Agora belonged to Dionysos Lenaios. For the altar, see Thompson 1953, 43–46; Thompson & Wycherley 1972, 132; Gadbery 1992, 467–469; Ekroth 1998, 119–120.

There is no compelling reason to label this altar an *eschara* simply on account of the lack of height (see the discussion below on the literary evidence for *eschara*).

64 Sourvinou-Inwood 1994, 280–285 and 287–288.

65 Gadbery 1992, 456, fig. 8, section D-D, 464, n. 41 and 475, pottery lot 380. The northern part of the low altar and its enclosure were perhaps removed when this wall was constructed. The wall was built entirely of fragments of re-used poros, which have been thought to have originated from the original altar of the Twelve Gods (see Crosby 1949, 95) but which may stem from the dismantled low altar.

66 Cf. Mikalson 1998, 246–247, on the question whether these ephebic inscriptions reflect the 5th-century Dionysia or the conditions of the Hellenistic period.

67 Gow 1912, 237–238, and Ridgeway 1912, 138, connected the *eschara* with heroes and traced a reminiscence of hero-cult in the Attic theatre, since Dionysos is called *heros* in a cult hymn cited by Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 299b. This passage is far from uncontroversial (see Brown 1982, 305–314, for the latest review of previous scholarship on the “*heros Dionysos*”). Brown concludes that there must have been some error in the transmission of the text.

68 Hiller von Gaertringen 1906, no. 202:8, line 37.

69 According to Kleidemos (FGrHist 323 F 1), Poseidon Helikonios had an *eschara* at Agrai, Athens.

70 Petzl 1987, no. 737, line 9; Robert L. 1939, 193–197, no. 10, line 9.

71 Robert L. 1939, 194.

72 IG XI:2 144 A, 61, 96 and 99; 156 A, 23; 199 A, 103; 287 A, 76; ID 409 A, 12; 440 A, 82; 1400, 4; 1409 Ba, col. II, 26; 1416 A, col. I, 36; 1417 B, col. I, 37; 1452 A, 29.

73 Robert F. 1939, 190; Robert F. 1952, 48.

74 Cf. LSJ s.v.; Hellmann 1992, 76; Roux 1979, 115, with n. 25 on the locative suffix -ὤν -ōn; Schulhof (1908, 39–40) argued that, judging by the context, *escharon* must be a building or a part of a building, but that it was possible that *escharon* was a type of scaffolding with no connection with a hearth; cf. IG II2 1672, 308, ἐσχ«ρε, "(ov, and the discussion of *eschara* in the sense of a wooden construction, *supra*, p. 29, n. 37.

75 Roof tiles or reeds for an *escharon*: ID 440 A, 82; IG XI:2 144 A, 61; new doors: ID 409 A, 12; cleaning: IG XI:2 287 A, 76; cf. Hellmann 1992, 76.

76 For the Archegesion and the Dioskourion, see below. Sarapeion C: ID 1416 A, col. I, 36; 1417 B, col. I, 37; 1452 A, 29. For the suggestion of the location of the *escharon* in this sanctuary, see Vallois 1944, 88–92; cf. Roussel 1916, plan III, building Z.

77 For the restoration by Ph.H. Davis, see Hellmann 1992, 73.

78 Robert F. 1953, 13–23; Daux 1962, 959–963; Daux 1963b, 862–869; Bruneau 1970, 424–426; Kuhn 1985, 227–232; *Guide de Délos*³ 1983, 200–201, no. 74; Ekroth 1998, 120–121. For the inscribed sherds from the sanctuary, some carrying the inscriptions Ἀρχηγέτηι, or Ἀρχ(ηγέτου), see ID 35. The first phase of the sanctuary dates to c. 600 BC: both structures were extended in the early to middle 5th century and underwent further changes in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

79 Robert F. 1953, 22; Bruneau 1970, 424; Hellmann 1992, 76. The date of the ash-altar is difficult to ascertain, but it seems to have been late Hellenistic or rather Roman (see Bruneau 1970, 424; Daux 1963b, 865).

80 Kuhn 1985, 229–232; sheep bones were found in the ashes (see Bruneau 1970, 428). A banquet relief dedicated to Anios shows the reclining hero being approached by a man and his servant leading a ram (see van Straten 1995, R154; Bruneau 1970, 428, pl. 5:2; for the inscription, see Butz 1994, 78, n. 4). For the prohibition on *xenoi* entering the courtyard, see Butz 1994 on ID 68.

81 For this construction, see Daux 1962, 960; Bruneau 1970, 425; Ekroth 1998, 121, fig. 1.

82 Kuhn 1985, 228–229. *Oikoi*: IG XI:2 287 A, 107–108; Bruneau 1970, 425 with n. 3. The same inscription also mentions an *oikos* (line 109) which has been identified with an enclosure in the south-eastern corner of the rectangular courtyard (see Bruneau 1970, 424–425).

83 Daux 1962, 960. The carbonized sheep bones found in the ash-heap and a deposit of sea-shells (oysters, mussels) may be the debris from dining (see Daux 1963b, 865 and 863, fig. 3; Bruneau 1970, 428).

84 Robert F. 1952, 5–50; Roux 1981, 43; *Guide de Délos* 1983, 258–260, no. 123. Bruneau 1970, 383–385, is doubtful.

85 Roux 1981, 41–55. *Hestiatorion*: IG XI:2 161 A, 97 (279 BC); *naos*: ID 461 Ab, 32 (169 BC).

86 Roux 1981, 53–55; cf. Bergquist 1990, 46–49.

87 ID 1400, 4 (between 314 and 166 BC); 1409 Ba, col. II, 26 (166–145 BC).

88 ID 1400, 4–6; 1409 Ba, col. II, 26–29. Other objects are of a different nature: hydria with metal voting ballots, a small stele and ingots.

89 Od. 14.420. A Linear-B tablet from Pylos mentions an *e-ka-ra*, taken by Ventris & Chadwick (1973, 499, Py 237) to refer to a portable hearth or brazier. See also Casevitz 1988, 58–59, for the earliest uses of the term.

90 Euripides also uses *eschara* for the household hearth, for example, *Cyc.* 384 and *El.* 801. An unidentified choral lyric fragment mentions the Pythian god at Delphi by the *escharai* (see Page 1962, *Fragmenta adespota*, Fr. 991).

91 Rudhardt 1958, 6; cf. Reisch 1907, 614.

92 For the variations in language between different classes of evidence, see Parker 1983, 13–14 and *supra*, p. 19, n. 22.

93 Eur. *Heracl.*: *eschara* 121, 127 and 341, *bomos* or its derivatives *bomios* or *probomios* 33, 61, 73, 79, 124, 196, 238, 249 and 344; *Supp.*: *eschara* 33 and 290, *bomian* 93 and *thymele* 65; *HF*: *eschara* 922 and *bomos* 974. Aesch. *Pers.*: *eschara* 205, the same altar as the *bomos* in line 203?

94 Eur. *Phoen.* 274.

95 Eur. *Alc.* 119; Ar. *Av.* 1232.

96 Apollon: Aesch. *Pers.* 205; Eur. *Andr.* 1102, 1138 and 1240; Eur. *Supp.* 1200; Eur. *Phoen.* 284. Zeus: Eur. *Heracl.* 121, 127 and 341; Eur. *HF* 922. Demeter and Kore: Eur.

Supp. 33 and 290 (only Demeter).

97*Daimones*: Eur. fr. 628 (Nauck 1889). Erinyes: Aesch. *Eum.* 108. The *escharai* which Athena promises the Eumenides in Aesch. *Eum.* 806 seem to refer to household hearths, rather than to altars used for sacrifices.

98 Eur. *Alc.* 119–121; Eur. *Andr.* 1100–1103.

99 For the translation of *bouthytos* as “for hecatombs”, see Casabona 1966, 140–142.

100 Eur. *HF* 926–930.

101 In Eur. *Heracl.* 121, 127 and 341, the supplicants have gathered around an altar of Zeus in his sanctuary. The *hestia* of the house could also be used for the same purpose (see Nilsson 1967, 78).

102 Eur. *Andr.* 1138; *Phoen.* 274.

103*Od.* 7.100; Chantraine 1968–80, s.v. *bwmón*; Casevitz 1988, 57–58.

104 Pouilloux & Roux 1963, 102–122. For the interpretation that Neoptolemos was killed by the *hestia* inside the temple, see Fontenrose 1960, 213–218.

105 Dem. [*In Neaer.*] 116. This *eschara* has often been identified with a Roman construction of brick; see Clinton 1988, 72 with n. 35; Scullion 1994, 113, n. 124; Mylonas 1961, 168–170; Kourouniotes 1936, 41–42. Earlier remains on the same spot consist of a 6th-century, polygonal wall and part of a curved wall (8th–7th century BC?), neither of which seems to have had a function similar to the Roman construction, see Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 96 and fig. 183, who suggests that the curved wall may have been part of a peribolos or *temenos* enclosure.

106 Lykourgos fr. 6.10 (Conomis 1970), ap. Harp. s.v. ἐσχάρα (Dindorf 1853). Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 2042), and *Suda* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Adler 1928–35, E 3242), follow Harp. but have lumped together Lykourgos and Ammonios. On the identification of the priestess, see Kunst 1927, 2457.

107*FGrHist* 323 F 1 (ap. *Anecd. Bekk.* s.v. Ἄγραι [Bekker 1814, vol. 1, 326–327]). For the identification of the archaeological remains of the sanctuary of Poseidon Helikonios, see Travlos 1971, fig. 154, no. 150, and fig. 379, no. 150.

108*Cyr.* 8.3.12.

109*FGrHist* 84 F 7: βωμοὺς θεῶν φησιν, ἐσχάρας δὲ ἡρώων. Neanthes is also quoted by Eustathius, *Od.* 6.305 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 255, lines 36–37), as saying “*bomoi* are for the *daimones* and *escharai* for the heroes”.

110 The quotation from Neanthes comes from his Κατὰ πόλιν μυθικά, an account of the mythical history of Kyzikos (see Laqueur 1935, 2108–2110). The precise identity of the writings of Neanthes is unclear and his accuracy is considered as unreliable (see *OCD* 3 s.v. Neanthes; commentary to *FGrHist* 84 F 7 by Jacoby, p. 144–149). This particular quotation is preserved in the Περί ὁμοίων καὶ διαφορῶν λέξεων (abbreviated Ammon. *Diff.*), probably dating to the 1st–2nd centuries AD (see *FGrHist* 361, commentary p. 83, n. 1). This latter work was originally written by Herennios Philon and is known in various versions by various authors, for example, Eranios Philon, Ptolemaios Askalonites and Symeon; see *KlPauly* 1 (1964), s.v. Ammonios 4; *Neue Pauly* 1 (1996), s.v. Ammonios 4; Heylbut 1887, 398, s.v. βωμός;

Tresp 1914, 90–91; Dihle 1959, 1863. The *Peri homoion kai diaphoron lexeon* was reworked by a certain Ammonios, probably during the Byzantine period, and this is the version that has been preserved; see KIPauly 1 (1964), s.v. Ammonios 4; *Neue Pauly* 1 (1996), s.v. Ammonios 4. For the edition of this text, see Nickau 1966.

111 On the Neoplatonic view of the cosmos, see Levy 1978, 509–512 and Nilsson 1950, 412–419, esp. 414. On the role of the heroes in the Neoplatonic divine hierarchy, see Rodríguez Moreno 2000, 91–100; Ramos Jurado 2000, 101–110. The division into Olympian, chthonian and hypochthonian deities (but without any mention of heroes) and their different kinds of sacrificial rituals is laid out in detail in Porph. *De phil.* 112–121.

112 Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.1168–1177.

113 FHG III, 136, F 75 (ap. Ath. 11.462b–c). The quote from Polemon by Athenaios is incomplete, which complicates the understanding of the ritual.

114 Strabon 9.2.11. Proposed locations for this *eschara* are somewhere on the north-western slope of the Acropolis (Keramopoulou 1929, 86–92; Dörpfeld 1937, 14–15 and 106–107; Broneer 1960, 59; Travlos 1971, 91) or to the south-east of the temple of Olympian Zeus in the Ilissos area (Judeich 1931, 386; Wycherley 1959, 68–72).

115 Paus. 4.17.4 and 10.27.2; the later *eschara* is also called *bomos* in the same passage.

116 On the meaning of *thylemata*, see Casabona 1966, 123–124.

117 AJ 3.149; cf. the use of *eschara* for a grating in an Epidaurian inscription, Peek 1969, 48, no. 52, lines 15 and 16.

118 For the use of the adjective ἔστιος in the sense τῆς ἐστίας (particular for Heliodoros), see Rattenbury, Lumb & Maillon 1960, vol. 2, 30, n. 2; cf. *Aeth.* 1.30.5.

119 FGrHist 627 F 2, 34; cf. Rice 1983, 118–119 and 171.

120 18.61.1.

121 AJ 3.148.

122 5.13.9.

123 Paus. 5.13.8–11 and 5.14.8–10. Ash-altars: Olympian Zeus, Olympian Hera and Ge at Olympia, Zeus at Pergamon and Hera on Samos. Altar of blood: Apollon at Didyma.

124 See FGrHist 361 F 1, commentary p. 118–120; Tresp 1914, 91, fr. 48.

125 1st–2nd century AD, but preserved in a later reworking; see the discussion above, in connection with Neanthes of Kyzikos, p. 45, n. 110.

126 FGrHist 361 F 1a (ap. Ammon. Diff. s.v. t [Nickau 1966, no. 113]): βωμοὶ μὲν γὰρ οἱ τὰς προσβάσεις ἔχοντες, ἐσχάρα δὲ ἡ πρὸς τὴν βιωτικὴν γινομένη χρῆσιν ἐπὶ γῆς τὰ δὲ πολυτελεῖ ἑστίαι, τὸ δὲ μέγαρον ἡ περιωικοδομημένη ἑστία, ἐνθα τὰ μυστικὰ τῆς Δήμητρος. Ammonios is quoted also by Harpokration, Photios and Suda, who give slightly different information.

127 This context echoes Soph. *Ant.* 1016.

128 Ptol. *Ascal.* s.v. βωμός (Heylbut 1887, 398). For the date, see OCD3 s.v. Ptolemaeus 1.

129 See *supra*, p. 45, n. 110; cf. *KlPauly* 4 (1974), s.v. Ptolemaios 4.

130 *Onom.* 1.7–8 (Bethe 1900–31): ἐσχάρα δ' ἰδίῃδ' δοκεῖ μὲν ὧδε ὀνομάζεσθαι, ἐφ' ἧς τοῖς ἥρωσιν ἀποθύομεν.

131 Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (Schwartz 1887): ἐσχάρα μὲν κυρίως ὁ ἐπὶ γῆς βόθρος ἔνθα ἐναγίζουσι, τοῖς κάτω ἐρχομένοις' βωμὸς δὲ ἐν οἷς θύουσι, τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις θεοῖς.

132 See *LSJ* s.v. 1. For the terms *bothros* and *enagizein* in this scholion, see below, pp. 71–72 and pp. 114–121.

133 Ap. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Bekker 1833, 78); Harp. s.v. ἐσχάρα (Dindorf 1853), quoting Ammonios; Ptol. *Ascal.* s.v. βωμὸς (Heylbut 1887, 398); Hsch. s.v. ἐσχάρα (Latte 1953–66, E 6446); Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 2041–2042); Eust. *Il.* 10.418 (van der Valk 1979, vol. 3, 101, lines 14–15); Eust. *Od.* 6.305 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 255, lines 32–34) and 7.153 (vol. 1, 270, line 33); *Anecd. Bekk.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Bekker 1814, vol. 1, 256–257); schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (Schwartz 1887).

134 Steph. Byz. s.v. βωμοί (Meinecke 1849); Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐσχάρα E (Theodoridis 1982–98, 2041–2042); *Anecd. Bekk.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Bekker 1814, vol. 1, 256–257); schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (Schwartz 1887).

135 Ap. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Bekker 1833, 78); Hsch. s.v. ἐσχάρα E (Latte 1953–66, 6446); schol. Hom. *Od.* 23.71 (Dindorf 1855). On the other hand, a scholion on Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 2.1172 (Wendel 1935) says that an *eschara* is a *bomos* built of small stones.

136 Harp. s.v. ἐσχάρα (Dindorf 1853), quoting Ammonios; Steph. Byz. s.v. βωμοί (Meinecke 1849); Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Theodoridis 1982–98, E2042), quoting Lykourgos and Ammonios; *Suda* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Adler 1928–35, E 3242), quoting Lykourgos and Ammonios; *Etym. Magn.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Gaisford 1848); Eust. *Il.* 10.418 (van der Valk 1979, vol. 3, 101, line 15); schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (Schwartz 1887).

137 Square base: schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (Schwartz 1887); rounded shape: Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 2041); *Anecd. Bekk.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Bekker 1814, vol. 1, 256).

138 Hsch. s.v. ἐσχάρα (Latte 1953–66, E 6447); *Etym. Gud.* s.v. ἐστία 1 (Sturz 1818, 213); Eust. *Od.* 6.305 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 255, line 33).

139 Ap. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Bekker 1833, 78); Harp. s.v. ἐσχάρα (Dindorf 1853), quoting Ammonios; Hsch. s.v. ἐσχάρα (Latte 1953–66, E6446); Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐστία (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 2025) and s.v. ἐσχάρα (E 2041); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Gaisford 1848); Eust. *Il.* 10.418 (van der Valk 1979, vol. 3, 101, lines 8–10); Eust. *Od.* 6.305 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 255, line 33) and 14.159 (vol. 2, 68, lines 11–15); *Anecd. Bekk.* s.v. ἐσχάρα (Bekker 1814, vol. 1, 256–257); schol. Aesch. *Sept.* 73i (Smith 1982).

140 Cf. the cooking pits found near the Tholos in the Athenian Agora (Thompson 1940, 25–27, 16, fig. 13, and 41, fig. 32); for barbecue sites located directly on the ground, see Bergquist 1988, 30–31 (Kato Syme); Bergquist 1992, 46 (Selinous, Naxos

and Metaponto). The stone lined pits found in many sanctuaries and usually considered as *bothroi* or *escharai* for chthonian sacrifices, may also have been cooking pits. See, for example, the seven pits from the late 4th century BC pre-monumental phase of the sanctuary of Poseidon and Amphitrite on Tenos (Étienne & Braun 1986, 28 and 187–188, pls. 3–4:1 and 68:3).

141 Schol. Aesch. *Pers.* 203 (Dindorf 1851); schol. Aesch. *Pers.* 203 (Massa Positano 1963, scholia); schol. Aesch. *Pers.* 205b (Massa Positano 1963, glossemata); schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (Schwartz 1887).

142 *Anecd. Bekk.* s.v. ἐσχάρρα (Bekker 1814, vol. 1, 256–257); schol. Opp. *Hal.* 5.307 (Bussemaker 1849).

143 Cf. Hsch. s.v. ἐσχάρρα (Latte 1953–66, E 6447); Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐσχάρρα and ἐσχάρας (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 2041–2042 and 2044); Eust. *Il.* 10.418 (van der Valk 1979, vol. 3, 101, lines 12–17); Eust. *Od.* 7.153 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 270, lines 34–36); schol. Ar. *Eq.* 1286a (Jones & Wilson 1969, vet.). For the earlier sources, see pp. 25–26.

144 Poll. *Onom.* 1.8 (Bethe 1900–31).

145 *Etym. Magn.* s.v. ἐσχάρρα (Gaisford 1848); cf. Eur. *HF* 922.

146 Eust. *Il.* 10.418 (van der Valk 1979, vol. 3, 101, line 13); Eust. *Od.* 6.305 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 255, line 37).

147 *Etym. Gud.* s.v. ἐστία 1 (Sturtz 1818, 213).

148 Hellmann 1992, 75–76; in some cases the whole altar was covered with stucco or plaster or repainted.

149 Serpentine: Heraion on Samos (Schleif 1933, 196 and 210). Gneiss: altar dedicated to Hera in the sanctuary of Poseidon, Thasos, my Fig. 3 (Bon & Seyrig 1929, 333–337, fig. 9). Terracotta: altar in the sanctuary of Apollon, Kyrene (Parisi Presicce 1991, 165 and pl. 51b–c).

150 No such metal trays are preserved, but occasionally altars show discolourations on the sides where rain water has dripped from the metal onto the stone, as on a small altar from Paros (see Ohnesorg 1991, 121 and pl. 25b). Other altars have a central cutting in the rough upper surface, where this metal pan could have been fastened, for example, the altar of Aphrodite Hegemone, Demos and the Graces from Athens (see Travlos 1971, figs. 103–104).

151 I have treated the depictions of upper parts of altars elsewhere (Ekroth 2001). This section is largely based on that study. For vase-paintings showing altar covers made of metal, see *ibid.*

152 This particular function as fire covers for altars may perhaps explain why some *escharai* listed among various objects from the Chalkotheke on Delos are labelled as πυρμαϊός (*IG* XI:2 145, 58; 161 B, 124; 164 B, 12 and 36; 199 B, 76 and 89, all dating from the late 4th to the early 3rd century BC) or as ἐφ' ὧν πῦρ καίεν (*IG* II² 120, 46; 1440, 53, both mid 4th century BC).

153 From the Chalkotheke on Delos, *IG* II² 1440, lines 53–54: ἐσχάραι χαλμαῖ, ἐφ' ὧν π[ύρ] καίεν, οὐ [χύ]γιεις; cf. line 59: ἐσχαρίδες χαλμαῖ οὐχ , ὕγιεις, mid 4th

century.

154 Furthermore, the actual ash-altar/*eschara* in the Archegeion dates to the late Hellenistic or even Roman period, see above, p. 37, n. 79. It may of course have had an Archaic/Classical predecessor.

155 For the archaeological remains of altars in hero-cults, see Ekroth 1998.

156 The heroes occupying a position separate from that of the gods is a thought developed particularly in the Neoplatonic texts, see Rodríguez Moreno 2000, 95–100; Ramos Jurado 2000, 103–110.

157 The term *enagizein* for sacrifices in hero-cults became more common in the Roman period (see below, pp. 90–91).

158 For references, see below, pp. 80–81, *Enagisterion*.

159 For this monument, see Pariente 1992, 195–225, esp. 195–197, and pl. 35. The pit measures 6.50 × 2.60 m and is 0.60 m deep. See also the Roman “*eschara*” of brick in the courtyard at Eleusis, *supra*, p. 44, n. 105.

160 Cf. Chadwick 1986, 515–516.

161 Deneken 1886–90, 2497; Rohde 1925, 50, n. 53; Pfister 1909–12, 474–475; Stengel 1910, 151; Eitrem 1912, 1123; Stengel 1920, 16–17; Nilsson 1967, 78; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 199.

162 Pfister 1909–12, 474–475; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 199.

163 Deneken 1886–90, 2497; Pfister 1909–12, 474–475; Stengel 1910, 151; Foucart 1918, 99; Rudhardt 1958, 129; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 199; Riethmüller 1999, 137.

164 Nilsson 1967, 78, 180 and 186.

165 Deneken 1886–90, 2497; Pfister 1909–12, 474–475; Riethmüller 1999, 123–143.

166 A third case is to be found in a Christian inscription from Sicily dating to the Roman period, in which *bothros* is used for the grave (*IG XIV 238*).

167 *IG XI:2 235, 3*.

168 [χ]οῖρος ὥστ[ε τό ἱερόν καθάρασθαι?] –.

169 Temple of Apollon: Bruneau 1970, 93; *IG XI:2 203 A*, 32–57. Thesmophorion: Bruneau 1970, 286–288; *ID 440 A*, 38–39 and 48.

170 Porph. *De antr. nymph.* 6, speaks of *bothroi* and *megara* as two different kinds of installations used in the cult of the gods of the underworld: ὑποχ θονίοις δὲ βόθρους καὶ μέγαρα ἰδρύσαντο. It seems unlikely that *bothroi* could be used as another term for *megara*, the holes known from sanctuaries of Demeter, in which piglets were deposited during the Thesmophoria (see Henrichs 1969, 31–37). On the *megara* and the deposition of piglets at Eleusis, see Clinton 1988, 72–79.

171 Krauss 1980, no. 11, line 25, the new edition and reading of the text followed here. Previous editions: Kaibel 1878, no. 1034; Buresch 1889, 81–86. Cf. Parke 1985, 152–153.

172 The epithet Εἰσαῖθν usually refers to Hades, see Buresch 1889, 84, line 23; *LSJ* s.v. Krauss 1980, 76 (line 24) and 79 (commentary), suggests Dionysos on the basis of the sacrificial animal.

- 173 Hom. *Il.* 17.58; *Od.* 6.92; Arist. *Hist. an.* 579a; *Metaph.* 1025a. Just like *eschara*, the term is found in medical contexts, and there *bothros* can mean a depression in the heart (Hippoc. *Corde* 5); cf. Durling 1993, s.v. *βόθριον*, in the plural referring to the sockets of the teeth.
- 174 Xen. *Oec.* 19.7 and 19.13.
- 175 Xen. *An.* 5.8.9.
- 176 Hymn. *Hom. Merc.* 112; Hippoc. *Nat. mul.* 109.
- 177 *Od.* 10.517–542, esp. 10.517; 11.23–50, esp. 11.25, 11.36, 11.42, and 11.95.
- 178 *Od.* 11.35–36; the animals may have been killed by cutting off their heads completely (*apodeirotomein*) rather than simply slitting their throats, see discussion, pp. 174–175.
- 179 Ion fr. 54 (Nauck 1889). The context deals with the mourning habits of the Egyptians, Syrians and Lydians.
- 180 Lycoph. *Alex.* 684; Paus. 10.29.8; Lucian *De astr.* 24; Philostr. *Her.* 43.14.
- 181 Lucian *Menip.* 9.
- 182 Philostr. *V A* 4.16.
- 183 *Argon.* 3.1026–1041 and 3.1194–1222.
- 184 *Orph. Argon.* 950–987. For the date and the relationship with Apollonios Rhodios, see West 1983, 37.
- 185 Hekate: Lucian *Philops.* 14. Kore: Paus. 2.22.3. *Hypochthonioi theoi*: Porph. *De antr. nymph.* 6; *De phil.* 118. *Chthonioi theoi*: Porph. *De phil.* 114; Philostr. *V A* 6.11. Any god to whom it is necessary to sacrifice: Ael. Arist. *Hier. log.* II 27.
- 186 Pelops: Paus. 5.13.2. Agamedes: Paus. 9.37.7 and 9.39.6. Achilles: Philost. *Her.* 53.11. Heroes in the garden of Akademos: Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.17.5; these heroes have been identified with either Harmodios and Aristogeiton (cf. *Ath. pol.* 58.1) or the dead in the Persian wars (see Parker 1996, 137).
- 187 *CAF*, vol. 3, Adespota, fr. 128 (Kock 1888), from New Comedy; Lucian *Charon* 22; Lucian *Philops.* 14; Heliod. *Aeth.* 6.14.3–6; *Orph. Argon.* 572.
- 188 Paus. 2.12.1. The association of the winds with *bothroi* may be due to the tradition that the winds resided in a *bothros* in Thrace (see schol. *Ap. Rhod. Argon.* 1.826b [Wendel 1935]; Hampe 1967, 9–10).
- 189 Lucian *Charon* 22; cf. *CAF*, vol. 3, Adespota, fr. 128 (Kock 1888); *Orph. Argon.* 569–575.
- 190 *Philops.* 14.
- 191 6.14.3–6.
- 192 *Ap. Rhod. Argon.* 3.1211–1220; Lucian *Philops.* 14; *Orph. Argon.* 966–982.
- 193 Paus. 9.39.6 and 9.37.7.
- 194 Philostr. *Her.* 53.11–12. Cf. Philostr. *V A* 4.16: Apollonios can get into contact with Achilles, even if he does not dig a *bothros* or tempt the souls with the blood of sheep.
- 195 Paus. 5.13.2. This possibility will be further discussed below, p. 178, in connection with Pind. *Ol.* 1.90.

- 196** Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.1026–1041 and 3.1194–1214; *Orph. Argon.* 950–987.
- 197** Ael. Arist. *Hier. log.* II 26–27.
- 198** Philostr. *VA* 8.7.9.
- 199** Paus. 2.12.1.
- 200** Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.1035–1036, 3.1199 and 3.1210; CAF, vol. 3, Adespota fr. 128 (Kock 1888); Lucian *Charon* 22; Lucian *Menip.* 9; Heliod. *Aeth.* 6.14.3–6; presumably also *Orph. Argon.* 572–575.
- 201** Blood poured into the *bothros*: Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.1208; Porph. *De phil.* 114; Philostr. *Her.* 53.11–12, digging of *bothroi* and slaughtering of a bull (*esphatton*), the whole ceremony being designated by the term *entemnein*. Sprinkling of the blood around it: Lucian *Menip.* 9; cf. Heliod. *Aeth.* 6.14.3–6, the woman performing the sacrifice sprays her own blood on the fires near the *bothros*.
- 202** *Aeth.* 1.17.5.
- 203** Paus. 5.13.2. For discussion of the rituals of Pelops, see below, pp. 190–192. On the dining on the meat from this sacrifice, see Ekroth 1999, 154.
- 204** Paus. 9.39.6.
- 205** *Hier. log.* II 27.
- 206** Heliod. *Aeth.* 6.14.3–6; *Orph. Argon.* 957–958.
- 207** 2.22.3
- 208** For *megara* and torches, see Burkert 1985, 242–243; Clinton 1988, 77.
- 209** Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.1032–1034.
- 210** Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.17.5; Philostr. *Her.* 53.11.
- 211** CAF, vol. 3, Adespota, fr. 128 (Kock 1888); Lucian *Charon* 22.
- 212** *Orph. Argon.* 571–572.
- 213** *Orph. Argon.* 960–963.
- 214** Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.1026–1041 and 3.1194–1214; Lucian *Menip.* 9; Ael. Arist. *Hier. log.* II 26–27; Heliod. *Aeth.* 6.14.3–6, on the battlefield; *Orph. Argon.* 950–951, at the enclosure of the dragon guarding the Golden Fleece.
- 215** CAF, vol. 3, Adespota, fr. 128 (Kock 1888); Lucian *Charon* 22; Philostr. *Her.* 53.11; *Orph. Argon.* 568–572.
- 216** Lucian *Philops.* 14.
- 217** Old woman: Heliod. *Aeth.* 6.14.3–6.
- 218** Paus. 2.12.1 (winds); 2.22.3 (Kore); 9.39.6 (Agamedes); Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.17.5 (heroes in the garden of Akademos).
- 219** Philostr. *Her.* 53.11.
- 220** Paus. 5.13.2; see below, pp. 190–192.
- 221** Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.17.5; Paus. 9.39.6. The term can also be used for a cave, such as the one located under the temple of Apollon at Hierapolis, Phrygia, and from which poisonous fumes emerged (Damaskios, *Vita Isidori*, fr. 131 [Zintzen 1967]). The use of *bothros* for a natural hollow is rare and in most cases, no matter the context, the term refers to a hollow created by man.
- 222** Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.17.5.

223 Philostr. *Her.* 53.11–13.

224 Paus. 9.39.6.

225 Paus. 5.13.2–4.

226 Eust. *Od.* 10.517 (Stallbaum 1825–26, vol. 1, 393, lines 16–29); schol. Hom. *Od.* 10.517 (Dindorf 1855).

227 Hsch. s.v. *κοτυλίσιμος* (Latte 1953–66, K 3818).

228 Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (Schwartz 1887); see above, p. 50.

229 One of the basic characteristics of the term *eschara*, no matter what the context, is an indication of it being hollow or surrounding something (see above, p. 26).

230 On Homer as normative for later conceptions of the Underworld, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 15–16. Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989, 71, lines 516–540, suggest that the poet in the *Nekyia* combines conceptions drawn from different spheres in order to create something new. On the idea that the blood ritual was taken over from the practices of oracular cult, see Page 1955, 24–25; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 83. On possible Near Eastern influences on the necromancy described in the *Nekyia*, see Johnston 1999, 88–90.

231 The other terms for pit, *βοθύνορ*, *λάικκος* or *ὄρυγμα*, all occur later, not before the 5th century BC (see *LSJ* s.v.).

232 Klaros: Krauss 1980, no. 11; Porph. *De phil.* 112–121; cf. Philostr. *VA* 8.7.9.

233 Deneken 1886–90, 2505; Pfister 1909–12, 466 and 477; Eitrem 1912, 1123; Foucart 1918, 98; Stengel 1920, 143 and 149; Rohde 1925, 116 and 140, n. 15; Méautis 1940, 16; Chantraine & Masson 1954, 100–101; Rudhardt 1958, 238; Casabona 1966, 204; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 194 and 205.

234 Deneken 1886–90, 2505–2506; Stengel 1920, 143 and 149; Rudhardt 1958, 238–239; Casabona 1966, 209; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 200.

235 Pfister 1909–12, 467; Eitrem 1912, 1123; Rohde 1925, 116 and 140, n. 15; Nagy 1979, 308, § 10n4; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41.

236 Casabona 1966, 85 and 204.

237 Stengel 1920, 143; Nock 1944, 593; Chantraine & Masson 1954, 100; Casabona 1966, 208–209; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1985, 200.

238 Deneken 1886–90, 2505–2506; Pfister 1909–12, 477; Stengel 1920, 143 with n. 8; Rudhardt 1958, 239; Burkert 1966, 103; Parker 1983, 329; Burkert 1985, 194; Parker (forthcoming).

239 Nock 1944, 592–593; Chantraine & Masson 1954, 101–102; Casabona 1966, 206; Nilsson 1967, 186.

240 Pfister 1909–12, 474–477; Rohde 1925, 116; Chantraine & Masson 1954, 101; Rudhardt 1958, 239.

241 Ar. *Tag. fr.* 504, line 12 (PCG III:2, 1984).

242 *IG* II² 1006, 26 and 69; cf. pp. 33–34; Mikalson 1998, 245.

243 In line 26, , ἐν ἡγίσσῳ is completely preserved.

244 The main sanctuary of Amphiaraios was at Oropos (see Petrakos 1968; Petropoulou 1981, 57–63; Schachter 1981, 19–25; Parker 1996, 146–149), but he was

also worshipped at Athens, Rhamnous and Piraeus (see Kearns 1989, 147). On Aias, see Deubner 1969, 228; Kearns 1989, 141–142; Parker 1996, 153–154; Mikalson 1998, 183–184.

245 On the *Amphiareia*, see Parker 1996, 149 and 247; Pélékidis 1962, 253; on the sacrifices, see Petropoulou 1981, 49, lines 25–36.

246 Parker 1996, 153–154; Pélékidis 1962, 247–249.

247 Loraux 1986, 39–41, considers the war dead as heroes who received *time* but does not explicitly say whether those at Marathon received a cult; Jacoby 1944, 39 and 47 with n. 49, classifies all war dead as heroes and dates the institution of the cult of the Marathonomachoi to 490/489 BC; Whitley 1994, 216–217, speaks of heroic honours given to the Marathonian war dead, at least in the first century BC; Welwei 1991, 62, argues that they were not considered to be heroes before Pausanias' time.

248 Loraux 1986, 38–41, argues that a particular characteristic of the ancient sources that speak of the war dead, in particular Thucydides, is that they suppress the element of cult in favour of politics; cf. Hornblower 1991, 292; Stupperich 1977, 62. Parker 1996, 132 and 135–137, points out that, even if the war dead were not explicitly called heroes, their cultic honours were indistinguishable from those of the heroes. On the Athenian 5th-century war dead being heroized, see also Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 194.

249 Pélékidis 1962, 183–209; Nilsson 1955, 17–29; Mikalson 1998, 181–185 and 246–249.

250 Jacoby 1944, 66; cf. Pélékidis 1962, 211–256; Mikalson 1998, 246–249. Epigraphical evidence: Reinmuth 1955 (complements IG II² 1032), IG II² 1006; 1008; 1009; 1011; 1027; 1028; 1029; 1030; 1039; 1040; 1041; 1042; 1043, dating from 127/6 to 38/7 BC.

251 IG VII 53 = Kaibel 1878, no. 461. Cf. Wade-Gery 1933, 95–97; Page 1981, 213–215, no. 16.

252 Wade-Gery 1933, 96, is sceptical of the attribution to Simonides. Page 1981, 213–215, dates the epigram to the early 5th century BC and excludes the possibility of Simonides as the author.

253 According to IG VII 53, 13, the stone has ENNTZEN, read as ἐν[ή]γ[ι]ζεν, also followed by Kaibel 1878, no. 461, and Lattimore 1962, 126–127. Wade-Gery 1933, 97, suggests ἐναγίζεν and Campbell 1991, 534 (Simonides, no. 16), ἐναγίζει. Page 1981, 213, n. 2, says that, while the stone has ἐναγίζεν, either ἐνήγισεν or ἐναγίζει must be intended and that the context is much in favour of the present tense.

254 Wade-Gery 1933, 96; cf. Campbell 1991, 532, n. 1.

255 OGIS, no. 764, line 16 = IGR IV 294. Schröder 1904, 152–160, no. 1, dated the text to the reign of Attalos III, 139–133 BC. The inscription has now been dated down to 69 BC (see Jones 1974, 183–205; cf. Gauthier 1985, 47–48).

256 On Diodoros Paspáros, see Kienast 1970, 224–225; Jones 1974; Gauthier 1985, 62–

257 Orlandos 1959, 162–173, esp. 170, line 13 (= SEG 23, 1968, 207); Robert J. & L. 1964–67, 308–311, no. 200; for a new edition of the text including a new fragment (irrelevant to Aristomenes), see Migeotte 1985, 597–607.

258 Mansel 1957, 407–409, no. 4 (= SEG 16, 1959, 418); Robert J. & L. 1959–63, 59–61, no. 252. The inscription dates to c. 100 BC, but the sarcophagus belongs to a group of sarcophagi reused for burials down to the 2nd century AD and decorated with later reliefs.

259 Frisch 1978, no. 23 = CIG 3645. This inscription is identical with the wrongly catalogued CIG 1976 from Macedonia.

260 Drew-Bear 1980, 533–536, esp. 534, line 2 = SEG 30, 1980, 1387 = Meriç et al. 1981, no. 3803b = Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 82.

261IG IV 203 = Gegan 1989, 350.

262 Broneer 1959, 312–319; Broneer 1973, 99–112; Gebhard 1993a, 89–94; Gebhard 1993b, 170–172; Gebhard & Reese (forthcoming); cf. Piérart 1998, 88–104.

263 Gebhard 1993a, 85, 89 and 93.

264 Broneer 1959, 313; Gebhard 1993a, 85 with n. 26; the bones have been re-studied by David Reese, see Gebhard & Reese (forthcoming).

265 On the analogy with θυσιαστήριον, meaning altar (Joseph. AJ 8.4.1), derived from θυσιάζειν, which replaces *thyein* in koine, see Casabona 1966, 139. The archaeological discoveries invalidate Fernand Robert's suggestions (1939, 178–179) that the *enagisterion* was the cave-like structure under the round temple of Palaimon, where a blood libation took place. The bull from which the blood came was, according to Robert's interpretation, killed and bled at another location and the meat burnt elsewhere, probably on a *bomos*. Similarly, Casevitz's interpretation (1988, 58) of *enagisterion* as an altar where the dead were honoured is not compatible with the archaeological findings at Isthmia.

266 Philostr. *Imag.* 2.16.3. The Palaimonion was possibly in use into the 3rd century AD, and, even if Philostratos did not see the rituals himself, it cannot have been difficult to obtain information on how they were performed.

267 Gebhard 1993a, 79.

268 Palaimon is mentioned in a fragmentary ode by Pindar, but no archaeological traces of a cult have been found before the Roman period (see Gebhard 1993b, 170–172 and 177, n. 71; Gebhard & Dickie 1999, 159–165). Gebhard (pers. comm.) refutes the identification of a Classical Palaimonion with three statue bases along the southern side of the earlier racetrack, made by Rupp 1979, 64–72.

269 Cf. Piérart 1998, 106–109.

270 Since non-participation sacrifices are discussed more fully in ch. II, a certain overlap in the treatment of the sources is inevitable.

271 1.167 and 2.44; the latter will be discussed below.

272 This sacrifice is peculiar, since it is hard to picture athletic games and horse-races not being accompanied by dining (and animal sacrifice) of any kind.

Fontenrose (1968, 98, n. 38) questioned the authenticity of the oracular response that called for the institution of the cult and suggested that this was an ancient and native Etruscan cult which was later identified by the western Greeks as that of the slain Phokaians.

273 Text after Chambers 1986.

274 At least the sacrifices to Artemis fell on that day and presumably also those to Enyalios; see Rhodes 1981, 650; Deubner 1969, 209; Pritchett 1979, 173–174; Mikalson 1975a, 18 and 50.

275 On which day the commemoration of the war dead fell is not definitely known. Jacoby 1944, 62–65, suggests that it took place at the Genesia on the 5th of Boedromion, a festival which was later called Epitaphia. Deubner 1969, 230, assigns these rituals to the Epitaphia; cf. Rhodes 1981, 651; Pritchett 1979, 183–184.

276 Deletion: Chambers 1986; cf. Poll. *Onom.* 8.91 (Bethe 1900–31). Emendation: Rhodes 1981, 650–652 emends *kai* with *epi* (by analogy with three inscribed bronze vases used as prizes in funerary games for the war dead) and considers the cult of Harmodios and Aristogeiton as distinct from the commemoration of those who had died in war; cf. Loraux 1986, 363, n. 149. Retaining: Pfister 1909–1912, 469; Calabi Limentani 1976, 11 and n. 11. Jacoby 1944, 38, n. 3, retains *kai* but states that Aristotle does not say that Harmodios and Aristogeiton received *enagismata* at the same time as the war dead did, and that the games were meant for these two as well, though this may have been possible.

277 Clairmont 1983, 14; Calabi Limentani 1976, 11–12. Deubner 1969, 230, ascribes both the commemoration of the war dead and the sacrifices to Harmodios and Aristogeiton to the Epitaphia, which was held annually at the Kerameikos. According to Pausanias (1.29.15), Harmodios and Aristogeiton were buried in the Kerameikos, but it is not known whether this burial was a cenotaph or a real grave, since the fate of their bodies in 513 BC is unknown (see Jacoby 1944, 38, n. 3, and 50, n. 64).

278 Loraux 1986, 38; Stupperich 1977, 54–55; cf. Seaford 1994, 121.

279 Pl. *Menex.* 244a; Dem. *Epitaph.* 36. On the unwillingness of the literary sources to elaborate on the cult of the war dead, see above, p. 76, n. 248. Therefore, the use of the terminology should perhaps not be pressed too far.

280 *Mir. ausc.* 840a.

281 On the opposition of *thyein* and *enagizein*, see Casabona 1966, 84–85 and 337.

282 On the Phoenician and Thasian contexts of the cults of Herakles, see Bonnet 1988, esp. 346–371.

283 *Od.* 11.601–603; Pind. *Nem.* 3.22. It has been suggested that *Od.* 11.602–604 is a 6th century interpolation, since the concept of Herakles' apotheosis is post-Homeric, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 86–87; see also Petzl 1969, 28–41; Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989, 114, lines 601–627.

284 On the connection between the manner of Herakles' death and the sacrificial rituals, see Nilsson 1922; Nilsson 1923.

285 Vandiver 1991, 93–97 and 136.

286 Vandiver 1991, 110.

287 Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 147.

288 Dieuchidas *FGrHist* 485 F 7. Dieuchidas (or rather Athenaios [6.262a] who is quoting him) further says that freemen continued to have this function $\text{ἔνταυθα τὸν Φορβάριον}$. The use of *thysia* could be taken as an indication that dining had a place in the continuous rituals performed to Phorbas; see Nock 1944, 580, n. 24. However, according to Diod. Sic. 5.58.5, Phorbas received heroic honours after his death and the dining would then have formed a part of the hero-cult of Phorbas rather than of the funerary cult.

289 Kleidemos *FGrHist* 323 F 14; McInerney 1994, 22. The passage concerns the ordinary dead (see Jacoby's commentary to *FGrHist* 323 F 14) and not heroes, as Kearns 1989, 3–4, assumes.

290 Isae. 6.51 and 6.65.

291 Ar. *Tag.* fr. 504, lines 12–14 (PCG III:2, 1984): $\thetaύομεν \dagger αὐτοῖσι τοῖς ἐναγίσμασιν ὥσπερ θεοῖσι, καὶ χοὰς γε χεόμενοι, αἰτούμεθ' αὐτοὺς δεῦρ' ἀνιέναι τὰγαθὰ.$

292 Klearchos fr. 58 (Wehrli 1969).

293 Diphilos fr. 37 (PCG V, 1986).

294 Parker (forthcoming) compares *enagizein* to *hagizein* and *kathagizein* which both seem to refer to the offerings being wholly destroyed, either by fire or in some other way.

295 The category “hero” is here chosen from the Greek point of view to facilitate the comparison of the chronological and geographical spread of the material, although there is no direct Roman equivalent to the Greek heroes and hero-cults. See further discussion below, p. 106 esp. n. 372.

296 For the references, see Tables 14–20, and for Pausanias, see also Ekroth 1999, 145–158.

297 Ekroth 1999, 147–149; cf. Pirenne-Delforge 2001, 125. *Taphos*: 2.20.3; 4.32.3; 6.21.9; 7.17.8; 7.24.1; 9.18.3; 10.24.6. *Mnema*: 1.4.4; 4.32.3; 5.4.4; 6.21.9; 6.21.11; 7.17.8; 7.17.13–14; 7.19.10; 7.20.9; 7.24.1; 8.14.9–10; 9.5.14; 9.18.3; 10.24.6. *Polyandron*: 8.41.1. *Choma ges*: 6.21.9 Burial/bones: 3.19.3; 4.32.3; 5.4.4; 8.14.9–10; 8.14.11; 8.23.7; 9.38.5. For the exceptions (1.41.9, 2.3.7 and 6.20.15–20), see Ekroth 1999, 155–156. Pausanias of course also mentions burials and tombs of heroes without commenting on the sacrificial rituals.

298 Ekroth 1999, 148–149; cf. Pirenne-Delforge 2001, 127–128. *Hieron*: 1.44.5; 3.20.8; 4.30.3. *Temenos*: 2.32.1; 3.13.7; 5.13.1–3. *Naos*: 2.32.1; 9.39.4. *Alsos*: 9.39.4. *Heroon*: 1.42.7. *Kenon erion*: 6.20.17. *Bomos*: 1.26.5; 6.20.15. *Bothros*: 5.13.2; 9.39.6.

299 Diod. Sic. 17.17.3; cf. Strabon 13.1.32; Cass. Dio *Epit.* 78.16.7 and Philostr. *V A* 4.16.

300 Philostr. *Her.* 52.3 and 53.11–13.

301 Paus. 1.4.4 and 10.24.6; Heliod. *Aeth.* 3.1.1–3.6.1, esp. 3.5.2.

- 302** Hippoc. [Ep.] 27 (Littré 1839–61, vol. 9, 414).
- 303** Sopater *Diarrh.* zet. 238.
- 304** Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.2; *De malign. Her.* 857f.
- 305** Strabon 6.1.15: at Heraklea, a city founded by the Pylians, the Neleids received an *enagismos*. Paus. 3.1.8: Theras worshipped on Thera; Paus. 9.18.4, the oikist Pionis at Pioniai, Mysia, from whose grave smoke rose by itself. On the graves in the cults of oikists, see Malkin 1987, 200–203.
- 306** Andriskos *FGrHist* 500 F 1. For the conjecture of *probata* instead of *panta* suggested by Rohde, see *FGrHist* 500 F 1, commentary.
- 307** Plut. *Vit. Alex.* 72.3–4.
- 308** On *enagismos* referring to the killing of humans in connection with a burial: Plutarch (*Vit. Pyrrh.* 31.1) speaks of the *enagismos* performed by Pyrrhos to his dead son, which was preceded by the killing of a great number of Spartans; cf. App. *B Civ.* 1.117, where Spartacus sacrificed (ἐνάγισαυς) 300 Roman prisoners to Krixos after his death.
- 309** Cass. Dio *Epit.* 68.30.1.
- 310** Plataiai: Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.2–5; the war connection is further emphasized by the archon using a sword for the killing of the bull sacrificed; cf. Lib. *Decl.* 13.59. Sicily: Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 18.6. Men of Oresthasion: Paus. 8.41.1. Thersander: Paus. 9.5.14. Chrysos: Hippoc. [Ep.] 27 (Littré 1839–61, vol. 9, 414). Heliodoros (*Aeth.* 1.17.5) mentions that the polemarchs *enagizousin* to the heroes at the Academy: these heroes may have been the Athenian war dead (see Parker 1996, 137 with n. 57) or Harmodios and Aristogeiton (cf. *Ath. pol.* 58.1; Poll. *Onom.* 8.91 [Bethe 1900–31]).
- 311** Iphikles: Paus. 8.14.10. Polykrite: Andriskos *FGrHist* 500 F 1.
- 312** Diod. Sic. 17.17.3; Strabon 13.1.32.
- 313** Polyb. 23.10.17. Purifications of the army do not seem to have been performed at the end of a campaign, but only after serious disorders, such as mutiny (see Pritchett 1979, 197–202).
- 314** Paus. 6.21.9–11.
- 315** Paus. 8.14.11.
- 316** Paus. 8.23.7.
- 317** Ael. *VH* 5.21.
- 318** Cf. Johnston 1997, 44–70, esp. 50.
- 319** Paus. 3.12.7 and 7.24.1.
- 320** A less serious case concerns the athlete Oibotas, who cursed his fellow Achaians, when he did not receive any special rewards after his victory at Olympia (Paus. 7.17.14). The curse led to a complete lack of Achaian victories, a trend which was not broken until several centuries later, when Oibotas was given a statue at Olympia and *enagizein* sacrifices at home.
- 321** Paus. 9.38.5.
- 322** Paus. 9.13.6.
- 323** Epaminondas' sacrifice to Skedasos and his daughters is mentioned in a

number of sources. According to Plutarch (*Vit. Pel.* 21–22, esp. 22.2), Pelopidas *eneteimon* a brown horse on the grave, while in *Am. narr.* 774d he speaks of a white horse being slaughtered (*sphagiazasthai*). Xenophon (*Hell.* 6.4.7) states that the Thebans decorated the monument of the young girls. Diod. Sic. 15.54.2 mentions Skedasos and the tomb of his daughters but gives no details of any sacrifice.

324 Sopater *Diarr. zet.* 238.

325 Nock 1950, 714; Cumont 1949, 332–334; cf. Waszink 1954, 391–394. As a rule, those who died honourably, such as soldiers in battle, did not become *biaiothanatoi*, see Johnston 1999, 149–150.

326 *De malign. Her.* 857d.

327 Ptolemaios Chennos 3.12 (Chatzis 1914); Paus. 2.10.1.

328 Hommel 1980; Hedreen 1991, 313–330, with references.

329 Strabon 13.1.32; cf. Julian. *Ep.* 79 mentioning the Achilleion and the tomb of Achilles at Ilion. Patroklos, Antilochos and Aias also received the same kind of worship. Diod. Sic. (17.17.3) speaks of the *enagismata* at the tombs of Achilles, Aias and the other heroes, and Cassius Dio (*Epit.* 78.16.7) mentions *enagismata* and armed races encircling the tomb of Achilles.

330 Philostr. *Her.* 53.8–15. In *V A* 4.16, Philostratos mentions the *enagismata* performed by the Thessalians and the public *thyein* sacrifices by the Trojans.

331 Arr. *Anab.* 7.14.7.

332 The ancient tradition concerning the religious status of Hephaistion varies. Arrianos (*Anab.* 7.23.6) and Plutarch (*Vit. Alex.* 72.3) call Hephaistion a hero, Diodorus Siculus (17.115.6) states that Alexander made him a *theos paredros* and, according to Lucian (*Cal.* 17), he was a *theos paredros* and *alexikakos*.

333 Paus. 3.19.3.

334 Paus. 9.29.6.

335 Paus. 2.11.7. Other cases following the same pattern: *enagizein* sacrifices to Eurytos at Ochalia instituted at the same time as the *thyein* sacrifices to the river Pamisos and held before the mystery of the Megaloi Theoi at Andania (Paus. 4.3.10); *enagizein* sacrifices to Eurypylos at Patras at the festival to Dionysos (Paus. 7.19.10); *thysia* to Apollon at Delphi being followed by the *enagismos* and procession to Neoptolemos (Helioid. *Aeth.* 2.35.2); hecatombs to Sarapis and *enagismoi* to Alexander (Herodian. *Div. Marc.* 4.8.7).

336 Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.1.

337 Neoptolemos: Paus. 10.24.6; cf. Paus. 1.4.4 and Helioid. *Aeth.* 3.5.2–3. Other cases, all mentioned by Pausanias: Phoroneus buried by the sanctuary of Nemean Zeus at Argos (2.20.3); Hyakinthos having his tomb in the altar of Apollon at Amyklai (3.19.3); Preuges buried in front of the sanctuary of Athena at Patras (7.20.9); Myrtilos buried behind the temple of Hermes at Pheneos (8.14.11).

338 In the *Imagines* by Philostratos (2.16.3), *thyein*, *thysia* and *enagismata* are all used to describe the sacrifices to Palaimon at Isthmia. Here, *thyein* and *thysia* seem to be used in a general sense, meaning any kind of sacrifice, and not in a particular sense,

constituting a contrast to *enagismata*. The sacrificial ritual at the Palaimonion seems to have been an *enagizein* sacrifice at which the bulls were destroyed in a holocaust (see above, pp. 80–81).

339 Plut. *Vit. Thes.* 4.1.

340 Plut. *Vit. Alex.* 72.3–4.

341 Paus. 2.10.1.

342 Philostr. *Her.* 53.8–13.

343 For the meaning of *entemnein*, see Casabona 1966, 225–227. On the use of the *bothroi*, see pp. 60–74.

344 Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.2–5.

345 Jameson 1994a, 38–39, with n. 18.

346 Jameson 1994a, 39, n. 18.

347 *Haimakouria* is found also in Pindar's description of the sacrifices to Pelops at Olympia (*Ol.* 1.90); see below, pp. 171–172.

348 Plut. *Vit. Alex.* 72.4; Polyb. 23.10.17.

349 Paus. 4.32.3; Ekroth 1999, 151–154; cf. Pirenne-Delforge 2001, 125, who points out that *enagizein* refers to destruction of the offerings, though not necessarily an animal but, for example, cakes.

350 Heliod. *Aeth.* 3.1.3–5; 3.5.2–3; 3.6.1; 3.10.1–3. Heliodoros produces other cases of an unusual use of *enagizein* and *enagismos*: for a battle-line sacrifice (1.28.1) and a magic sacrifice aimed at resurrecting a corpse (6.13.6).

351 War dead at Plataiai: Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.2. Achilles: Philostr. *Her.* 53.11. Aristomenes: Paus. 4.32.3. Palaimon: Philostr. *Imag.* 2.16.3.

352 Herakles: Paus. 2.10.1. Polykrite: Andriskos *FGrHist* 500 F 1.

353 Strabon 6.3.9.

354 Plut. *Vit. Thes.* 4.1.

355 Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.1. A *hiereion* could be any kind of victim.

356 Heliod. *Aeth.* 3.1.3–4; 3.5.2.

357 Paus. 3.19.3.

358 Philostr. *Her.* 52.3.

359 Burial: Plut. *Vit. Sol.* 21.5; Philostr. *Her.* 31.8; Philostr. *Imag.* 2.29.4; Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.18.2. Regular funerary cult: Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 270a; Lucian *Catapl.* 2; Lucian *Philops.* 21; Lucian *De merc.* 28; Ael. *Arist. Smyrna* 8; Philostr. *Her.* 53.23; Diog. Laert. 10.18; Sopater *Diair. zet.* 200; Lib. *Progym.* 2.13.

360 Libations: Lucian *Catapl.* 2; Lucian *Philops.* 21. *Popana*: Lucian *Catapl.* 2. Wreaths: Lucian *Philops.* 21; Lucian *De merc.* 28; Lib. *Progym.* 2.13.

361 Lucian *De merc.* 28. Cf. Lucian *Catapl.* 2: *choai, popana* and *enagismata*.

362 Lucian *Philops.* 21.

363 Plut. *Vit. Sol.* 21.5; Ruschenbusch 1966, F 72c. Cf. Toher 1991, 161.

364 Lucian *De merc.* 28.

365 Philostr. *Imag.* 2.29.4.

366 Sopater *Diair. zet.* 200, ἐμ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ἐπισφάξαι.

367 Plut. *Vit. Pyrrh.* 31.1. Plutarch's use here of *enagismos* for the killing of humans as an act of grief is the same as in *Vit. Alex.* 72.3 concerning Hephaistion and the slaughter of the Kossaians by Alexander.

368 Ael. Arist. *Smyrna* 8.

369 Lucian *Catapl.* 2.

370 Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 270a.

371 Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.18.2.

372 Roman religion seems more or less to have lacked any intermediate categories between gods and men. Prominent dead characters, such as Aeneas or Romulus, were looked upon as gods or identified with gods rather than considered as heroes. Even in the cult of the dead the deceased shared some degree of divinity, see Beard, North & Price 1998, 31 and 140–149, esp. 141. The Greek hero of Plautus' *Aulularia* has been replaced by a *lar*, see Kuiper 1940, 16–17, 36–37 and 39–41; cf. Latte 1960, 99. On the difficulty of transferring Greek religious concepts to the Roman sphere, see Price 1984b on the use of *theos* in relation to the Roman Imperial cult and Mikalson 1975b on the relation ἡμέρα ἀποφράς *dies ater*. For a discussion of Plutarch's view of Hellenic influences on Roman culture, (though not religion), see Swain 1990, 126–145.

373 Pompey: Cass. Dio *Epit.* 69.11.1; *Epit.* 76.13.1. Nero: Cass. Dio *Epit.* 64.7.3. Geta: Cass. Dio *Epit.* 78.12.6. Vestal Virgins: Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 287a; cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.67.4. The war dead: Cass. Dio *Epit.* 67.9.6; *Epit.* 68.8.2. Krixos: App. *B Civ.* 1.117.

374 Vestal Virgins: Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 287a; cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.67.4, lack of *enagismoi* at grave as a means of dishonouring the seduced Vestals. Larentia: Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 272e. Cf. Cass. Dio *Epit.* 69.11.1, *enagizein* sacrifice at the *mnema* of Pompey in Egypt.

375 Killed in war: Cass. Dio *Epit.* 67.9.6; *Epit.* 68.8.2 (war dead in Dacia); App. *B Civ.* 1.117 (Krixos). Murdered: Cass. Dio *Epit.* 69.11.1; *Epit.* 76.13.1 (Pompey); Cass. Dio *Epit.* 78.12.6 (Geta). Suicide: Cass. Dio *Epit.* 64.7.3 (Nero). Buried alive: Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 287a (Vestal Virgins). On the Vestal Virgins, see also Cornell 1981, 27–37.

376 App. *B Civ.* 1.117.

377 Cass. Dio *Epit.* 78.12.6.

378 Parentalia: Joseph. *AJ* 19.272; Plut. *Vit. Num.* 19.5; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 268b and 272d–e; Plut. *Vit. Cat. Mai.* 15.3. Lemuria: Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 285b. For these festivals, see also Latte 1960, 98–99; Beard, North & Price 1998, 50.

379 Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 272d.

380 Cass. Dio *Epit.* 67.9.3.

381 Cass. Dio *Epit.* 64.13.5.

382 Plut. *Vit. Cat. Mai.* 15.3.

383 App. *Pun.* 84 and 89.

384 Heliod. *Aeth.* 6.13.6–6.14.6. See also discussion above, pp. 66–70.

385 Iambl. *VP* 27.122.

386 Philostr. *Her.* 53.5.

387 Paus. 8.34.3. Pirenne-Delforge 2001, 125–127, explains the use of *enagizein* in this case as related to the goddesses' divine character being a secondary development.

388 Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 359b.

389 Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.28.1. On sacrifices before battle, see Jameson 1991.

390 Heliod. *Aeth.* 10.16.7.

391 Greg. Nys. *Encom. xl mart.* II 776M.

392 Hymn. 6.27. In line 29, the text also mentions another completely burnt sacrifice, *júh kalá* of frankincense. For the term *thyos*, see Casabona 1966, 109–115.

393 Joseph. *BJ* 1.32; 1.39; 1.148; 6.98. In *AJ* 19.272, Josephus uses *enagismoí* for sacrifices to the dead.

394 Milgrom 1991, 456–457; de Vaux 1960, 364; Lust 1993, 283–284 and 295.

395 *BJ* 1.148.

396 Porph. *De phil.* 112. In 114, *θυσίας ἐναγίζων* seems to refer only to the rituals of the *chthonioi* and *nerterioi theoi*.

397 Markellos fr. 125 (Klostermann & Hansen 1991).

398 Cf. Burkert 1966, 118.

399 Ael. *VH* 5.21; Phot. *Lex.* s.v. αἰγός τρόπον (Theodoridis 1982–98, A 532).

400 Ael. Arist. *Contr. Lept.* 106.

401 For the reading *δὴ τισι. θυσιῶν*, see Dindorf 1829, vol. 2, 683, app. crit. line 4.

402 The only exception would be the use of *θυσίας ἐναγίζων* Porphyrus' *Philosophy from oracles* (112) for the sacrifices to the heavenly gods. The meat from the animals killed at these sacrifices was to be eaten by the worshippers (117 and 120).

403 Greg. Nys. *Encom. xl mart.* II 776M; Synesios *Hymn.* 6.27; Joseph. *BJ* 1.32, 1.39, 1.148 and 6.98.

404 Iambl. *VP* 27.122: the chthonian gods rejoice in *enagismata* involving great expense (τοῖς μετὰ μεγάλης δαπάνης ἐναγισμοῖς). Cf. Ael. Arist. *Contr. Lept.* 106: great expense on *enagismata* (πολυτελείας ἐναγισμάτων). For the alternative reading *δὴ τισι θυσιῶν* see p. 113, n. 401.

405 Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.28.1.

406 Philostr. *Her.* 53.5.

407 Cf. Burkert 1970, 1–16, esp. 8; Burkert 1983, 192–194, suggests the blood of a ram.

408 Rituals at burial: schol. Hom. *Od.* 1.291 (Dindorf 1855). Sacrifices and rituals at the grave: schol. Aesch. *Cho.* 23b (Smith 1976); *Suda* s.v. ἀπαργμάτων ὠρίων καιριώτερον (Adler 1928–35, 2921); Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐναγίσματα (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 793), offerings of fruit at the grave. Meals given to the dead: schol. Aesch. *Cho.* 23b and 484c (Smith 1976). The offerings to the dead: schol. Lucian *Catapl.* 2 (Rabe 1906). General contexts: Erot. *Voc. Hipp.* 74.80; Poll. *Onom.* 3.102 and 8.146 (Bethe 1900–31); Hsch. s.v. αἵμαουρία (Latte 1953–66, A 1939), s.v. ἀποφράδες (A 6792), s.v. ἐγγριμᾶσθαι (E 148), s.v. ἐναγίζειν (E 2586), s.v. μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαρῶ (M

1210); *Suda* s.v. ἐναγίζειν (Adler 1928–35, E 1092), s.v. ἀποφράδες ἡμέραι (A 3642), s.v. χοάς (Q 364); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. ἐναγίζειν (Gaisford 1848); schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (Schwartz 1887); schol. Ar. *Ach.* 961 (Pfister 1909–12, 473); schol. Ar. *Ran.* 293 (Koster 1962); schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.146a (Drachmann 1903–27); schol. Ap. *Rhod. Argon.* 1.587 (Wendel 1935).

409 Schol. Nic. *Ther.* 860a (Crugnola 1971); cf. Burkert 1983, 218.

410 *Katachthonioi theoi*: Erot. *Voc. Hipp.* 74.80; schol. Lucian *Tim.* 43 (Rabe 1906). Cf. schol. Aesch. *Supp.* 122 (Smith 1976): sacrifices (*enagismata*) to the gods if death is avoided.

411 Schol. Hom. *Il.* 1.464 b¹–b² (Erbse 1969–88, vol. 1).

412 Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 3.33b, cf. 3.33d (Drachmann 1903–27). Pindar (*Ol.* 3.19) speaks of the consecrated altars (βωμῶν ἀγισθέντων) of Zeus. *Hagizein* in the Classical period meant “to place in the domain of the sacred” (Casabona 1966, 198; Rudhardt 1958, 235–236) but may have been interpreted by the scholiast as referring particularly to a complete annihilation by fire: cf. *Etym. Magn.*, explaining *enagizein* as *katakaiein* and deriving it from *hagizein* (s.v. ἐνναγίζειν [Gaisford 1848]).

413 Poll. *Onom.* 8.91 (Bethe 1900–31): *enagizein* sacrifices to Harmodios mentioned previously in the *Ath. pol.* 58.1; cf. Heliod. *Aeth.* 1.17.5. Phot. *Lex.* s.v. αἰγὸς τρόπον (Theodoridis 1982–98, A 532): *enagizein* sacrifices to the children of Medea, cf. Ael. *VH* 5.21; Markellos fr. 125 (Klostermann & Hansen 1991). *Suda* s.v. ἐναγίζων (Adler 1928–35, E 1093), quoting Polybios (23.10.17) on the sacrifices to Xanthos.

414 Aischylos: schol. Aesch. *PV, Vita Aeschyli* 11 (Herington 1972). Themistokles: schol. Ar. *Eq.* 84b (Jones & Wilson 1969, vet.).

415 Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 84b (Jones & Wilson 1969, vet.); cf. Ar. *Eq.* 84.

416 In fact, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are used also by the scholiasts on Homer, Aischylos, Euripides, Aristophanes and Nikander to explain various features of these texts (not connected with sacrifices to heroes), but the terms are never used by these authors themselves.

417 Pind. *Ol.* 1.90; for the contents of these sacrifices, see below, pp. 190–192. Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.146a–d and 1.150a (Drachmann 1903–27).

418 Thuc. 5.11; for the contents of these sacrifices, see below, pp. 184–185. Schol. Thuc. 5.11.1 (Hude 1927).

419 Ap. *Rhod. Argon.* 1.587–588; schol. Ap. *Rhod. Argon.* 1.587 (Wendel 1935). Cf. the *entemmetai sphagia* to Polyeidōs and his children in Dion. Byz. *Bosp.* 14 explained in the scholia as *enagizein* (schol. Dion. Byz. *Bosp.* 19 [Wescher 1874]).

420 Thuc. 3.58; for the contents of these sacrifices, see below, p. 179. Schol. Thuc. 3.58.4 (Hude 1927).

421 Pind. *Isthm.* 4.61–68; for the contents of these sacrifices, see below, pp. 181–182. Schol. Pind. *Isthm.* 4.104b (Drachmann 1903–27). The scholiast in this case was Chrysippos (1st century BC), who is generally considered as untrustworthy (see Körte 1900, 131–138).

422 Pind. *Pyth.* 5.85–86. For the contents of these sacrifices, see below, p. 177.

- 423 Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 5.113b (Drachmann 1903–27).
- 424 Pind. *Nem.* 7.46–48; for the contents of these sacrifices, see below, p. 183. Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 7.62c (Drachmann 1903–27). Perhaps the scholiast was influenced by Heliodoros' description of the sacrifices to Neoptolemos in the *Aethiopica*.
- 425 Hsch. s.v. ἐναγίζειν (Latte 1953–66, E2586); Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐναγίζων (Theodoridis 1982–98, 794); *Suda* s.v. ἐναγίζειν and ἐναγίζων (Adler 1928–35, E 1092–1093); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. ἐναγίζειν (Gaisford 1848).
- 426 Schol. Ar. *Ach.* 961 (Pfister 1909–12, 473); cf. *Suda* s.v. χοάς (Adler 1928–35, Q 364). This scholion is found only in Pfister (1909–12, 473) and not in Wilson's edition (1975) of the scholia on this play.
- 427 Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐναγίσματα (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 792).
- 428 Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 7.62c (Drachmann 1903–27).
- 429 *Etym. Magn.* s.v. χύτλα (Gaisford 1848); schol. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.1075–77a (Wendel 1935).
- 430 Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.146d; cf. 1.146a (Drachmann 1903–27); Hsch. s.v. αἱμαουρίαι, (Latte 1953–66, A 1939), cf. s.v. ἐντέμνουσι (E 3346).
- 431 Schol. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.587 (Wendel 1935).
- 432 Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 274 (Schwartz 1887). On the relation between *bothroi* and blood, see above, pp. 60–74.
- 433 Hsch. s.v. ἐναγίσματα (Latte 1953–66, E 2587), s.v. ἐναγισμοί (E 2588); Phot. *Lex.* s.v. ἐναγισμοί (Theodoridis 1982–98, E 795), s.v. ἐναγίζων (E 794); *Suda* s.v. . ἐναγισμοί (Adler 1928–35, E 1094).
- 434 Schol. Hom. *Il.* 1.464 b¹–b² (Erbse 1969–88, vol. 1).
- 435 Schol. Aesch. *Cho.* 484c (Smith 1976).
- 436 The use of *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* as explanations for *thysia* are another matter.
- 437 Schol. Hom. *Il.* 3.273b (Erbse 1969–88, vol. 1).
- 438 Agos as *miasma*: Hsch. s.v. ἐναγίζειν (Latte 1953–66, E 2586); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. ἐναγίζειν (Gaisford 1848). *Enagismata* as *katharmata*: schol. Hom. *Od.* 1.291 (Dindorf 1855).
- 439 Spawforth & Walker 1985; Spawforth & Walker 1986; Cartledge & Spawforth 1989, 99, 106–107, 164–165 and 190–211. For archaism in general, see Bowie 1970, 3–41; Anderson 1993, 101–132; in religion, see Lane Fox 1987, 64–101.
- 440 See Ekroth 1999, 151–152 and Table 2. It should be noted that, of the 29 *enagizein* sacrifices mentioned by Pausanias, 26 were contemporaneous rituals. On Pausanias' interest in the past, see further Elsner 1992, 11; Arafat 1992; Alcock 1993, 174.
- 441 Plut. *Vit. Thes.* 4.1; Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.2 and 21.5.
- 442 Philostr. *Her.* 53.8–14, esp. 53.14.
- 443 Kos: Sor. *Vit. Hipp.* 3.6. For an earlier date of this text, see Sherwin-White 1978, 355–356. Children of Medea: Ael. *VH* 5.21. Megara: IG VII 53, 13 = Kaibel 1878, no. 461.

444 Price 1984a, 32–36 and 207–220. Price (33 and 209) stresses that heroic sacrifices (*enagismata*) were never used in the cult of the Hellenistic kings and the Roman emperors. Lanciers 1993, 204–223, gives one possible example of a non-participation sacrifice in a Hellenistic ruler cult, but this sacrifice was performed in a Hebrew context, which may have influenced the choice of ritual.

445 Price 1984a, 32–36.

446 The *enagismata* mentioned in *Ath. pol.* 58.1 seem to have concerned only Harmodios and Aristogeiton and not the war dead (see above, pp. 83–85). For the sacrifices to the war dead, see also p. 197.

447 Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 18.6.

448IG II² 1006, 26 and 69 (123/2 BC).

449IG VII 53 = Kaibel 1878, no. 461.

450 Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.2–5; *De malign. Her.* 872f; cf. *Lib. Decl.* 13.59. The Classical sources speak of offerings of clothes, customary gifts and *aparchai* (Thuc. 3.58). For the distinctions between Plutarch's account and the earlier sources mentioning this cult, see Étienne & Piérart 1975, 66–67 and 74–75; Schachter 1994, 129–132 and 137–138; Parker 1996, 137, n. 57.

451 Chaniotis 1991, 138–142; Jacoby 1944, 66; Cartledge & Spawforth 1989, 192.

452 The cult of the Megarian war dead was perhaps instituted or at least reorganized in the 4th century AD, see IG VII 53 = Kaibel 1878, no. 461, and discussion above, pp. 77–78. Similarly, there is no Classical evidence for the *enagizein* sacrifices to the Marathonian war dead, only documented in a late-2nd-century BC inscription, IG II² 1006, 26 and 69.

453IG IV 203 = Gegan 1989, 350; for the archaeological evidence, see above, pp. 80–81. For the Roman aspect of this cult, see also Piérart 1998, 106–109.

454 Cf. the interesting suggestion by Wilamowitz (1931, 385–387) that the holocaust of live animals to Artemis Laphria at Patras, described by Pausanias (7.18.11–13), was a Roman adaptation or even a complete reconstruction of the cult in accordance with the contemporary *venationes*, animal fights in the amphitheatres. The distinctions between *eschara* and *bomos* became more pronounced in the Roman period, see above, pp. 58–59.

455 See Ekroth 1999, 158.

456 Ekroth 1999, 149, Table 1.

457 See in particular Paus. 2.10.1; cf. Ekroth 1999, 151–156.

458 Hdt. 2.44; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.1; Plut. *De malign. Her.* 857d; Ptolemaios Chennos 3.12 (Chatzis 1914); Paus. 2.10.1.

459 Achilles: Strabon 13.1.32; Philostr. *Her.* 53.8–15; Philostr. *V A* 4.16. In the case of Herakles, it is doubtful to what extent the *enagizein* sacrifices were ever actually performed (see below, pp. 219–221 and p. 238).

460 It should be noted that the only *enagizein* sacrifices that Achilles received were performed at his tomb at Troy. Herakles, on the other hand, had no tomb and is connected with *enagizein* sacrifices at Thasos, Kleonai and Sikyon.

461 The construction of *enagizein* with an accusative is a post-Classical development: earlier, the term refers only to a ceremony and not to an action (see Casabona 1966, 205 and 209).

Chapter II. Evidence for sacrifices in hero-cults down to 300 BC

1 Chapter II deals exclusively with sources dating to before 300 BC, in order to distinguish the sacrificial rituals in hero-cults in the Archaic to early Hellenistic periods from the contemporaneous evidence alone. As in the preceding section, the epigraphical and literary sources will be examined separately.

2 As I mentioned in the introduction, heroes have commonly been considered as having sacrificial rituals different from those of the gods: holocaustic sacrifices, libations of blood, offerings of meals. *Thysia* sacrifices, at which the animal was divided between the deity and the worshippers and the ritual was followed by dining, have been regarded as exceptions or late developments in the cult of the heroes. In order to test this assumption, the occurrence of these four kinds of rituals has been investigated. Each category of ritual has been defined as follows:

1. *Destruction sacrifices*. At this kind of sacrifice, the animal victim was totally destroyed and no meat was available for consumption. The destruction could be accomplished by burning, by total immersion in water or simply by leaving the carcass at the place of the sacrifice. This category also includes sacrifices at which a larger part of the animal was destroyed than was usual at a *thysia* (see below, no. 4).

1

2. *Blood rituals*. These include the rituals at which the blood of the victim was of special importance, either because it was treated in a particular way, for example, poured out at a specific

location, or because the animal was killed in a manner emphasizing the blood.

3. *Theoxenia*. The term *theoxenia* (*heroxeinia* exists but is very rare) here stands as a collective term for the offerings of food of the kind eaten by humans.

2

These offerings could consist of grain, fruit and cakes, but also of portions of meat, either cooked or raw. They were usually placed on a table (*trapeza*). A couch could be prepared and the recipient of the sacrifices was invited to come and dine.

4. *Thysia sacrifices followed by dining*. At these sacrifices, the animal was consecrated to the divinity and slaughtered. The deity's share of the victim (fat, bones, gall-bladder) was burnt, while the meat fell to the worshippers. The whole ceremony was concluded by the participants dining, either collectively in the sanctuary or at home.

3

The character of the material does not always make it possible fully to follow the structure outlined above. A sacrifice could consist of a combination of rituals, for example, a *thysia* with dining initiated by a blood ritual or *theoxenia* performed in connection with *thysia*. Since the same inscription or passage in a text may contain evidence for more than one kind of ritual, a certain degree of repetition is inevitable.

4

The evidence for sacrifices to heroes occurs in different contexts in the epigraphical and literary sources, respectively, and therefore the two parts differ somewhat in the detailed structure. The review of the epigraphical evidence ends with an examination of the four, well-preserved Attic, sacrificial calendars from Thorikos, Marathon, Erchia and the *genos* of the Salaminioi, since the completeness of these four inscriptions makes it possible to discuss the relation between heroes and gods as recipients of sacrifices, as well as local variations and patterns in the sacrifices to heroes. The review of the literary evidence concludes with a discussion on the use and meaning of the specification of some sacrifices as $\omega\varsigma \eta\rho\omega$.

5

Libations have not been included in this study, unless they form part

of an animal sacrifice to a hero.

3

To fully understand and evaluate the use and functions of libations in hero-cults, an extensive study of the material is needed, also in contexts outside hero-cults, i.e., in the cult of the gods and in the cult of the dead. Such an investigation is outside the scope of this work.

6 A few words should also be said about the geographical distribution of the material. The basic geographical area of concern here is the Greek mainland and the islands of the central Aegean. However, the inscriptions that describe sacrifices to heroes come almost exclusively from Attica. Any study of sacrificial rituals in the Archaic and Classical periods will, to a large extent, have to depend on the Attic evidence, since the most complete and extensive sacrificial calendars and sacred laws have been found in that region (Table 23).

Table 23. Number of inscriptions with religious contents, based on the dated inscriptions in *LS* and *LSS*.

Origin	6th century	5th century	4th century	Total
Athens/Attica	1	27	36	64
Peloponnese	4	4	2	10
Central Greece	—	9	9	18
Aegean islands	1	18	33	52
Total	6	58	80	144

Some new evidence can be added to Sokolowski's collections of sacred laws, for example, the sacrificial calendar from Thorikos (Daux 1983), but the general spread of the material is still the same geographically and chronologically.

7 Outside Attica, inscriptions dealing with religious matters are markedly less frequent and are dated mainly to the Hellenistic period. The Aegean islands, and Kos in particular, have yielded some sacrificial calendars and sacred laws, but heroes are only mentioned occasionally. Crete has produced some early epigraphical material but with little bearing on religious matters.

4

In other regions, such as the Peloponnese and the colonies, occasional inscriptions dealing with religion have been recovered, for example,

the extensive sacred laws from Kyrene and Selinous.

5

8

How is the dominance of the Attic material to be handled? Even though it cannot automatically be assumed that the information on hero-cults stemming from the Attic inscriptions can be treated as valid also for the rest of the Greek world during the same period, there is very little material from other regions to decide whether, and to what extent, there were regional differences and what cultic expressions these differences may have had. The Athenians may have taken greater interest in their heroes than other city states did, judging from the sheer number of Attic heroes known and how well represented they are in the religious inscriptions. Still, hero-cults are documented in all Greek regions, and the Athenian interest may simply be a result of the abundance of the epigraphical documentation from this area.

6

The positive side of the amount of Attic epigraphical evidence, however, is the fact that it is large enough to make it possible to discern variations in the sacrificial practices and attitudes to heroes within one region.

7

9

The hero-cults mentioned in the literary sources, on the other hand, show a wider geographical spread, which can help to balance the Attic predominance in the epigraphical material.

8

Of the approximately 50 herosacrifices that will be discussed here, a fifth is found in Athens and almost as many in the Peloponnese and central Greece respectively. To this evidence can be added a handful of cases from northern Greece, Ionia and the Greek colonies, as well as occasional, non-Greek contexts which are still of interest.

9

1. Epigraphical evidence

1.1. Destruction sacrifices

The evidence for the destruction of a larger part of the animal victim than at a regular *thysia* or of the total destruction of the victim is not abundant in the inscriptions that concern hero-cults. In all, there is only testimony for this kind of ritual in two of the sacrificial calendars from Attica, the one from Erchia and the one of the *genos* of the Salaminioi, both dating to the first half of the 4th century BC. Only four non-participatory sacrifices to heroes are explicitly mentioned, all being holocausts.

11

In the calendar from Erchia, the hero Epops received two holocaustic sacrifices on the 5th of Boedromion, while the heroine Basile was given a holocaust on the 4th of the same month.

10

No other sacrifices were performed on these occasions, either to Epops or to Basile or to any other deities.

12

The victims of the two holocausts to Epops were piglets and the sacrifices were to be followed by libations designated as wineless (*nephalios*). Sacrifices to Epops are known only from the Erchia calendar. The mythological context of Epops is not clear, but he may also be mentioned in a papyrus fragment of the *Aetia* by Kallimachos, in which one passage may concern a conflict between the demes Paiania and Erchia.

11

13

The sacrifice to Basile consisted of a white, female lamb and was also followed by a wineless libation. The colour of the animal is to be noted, since holocausts have commonly been classified as chthonian sacrifices, and it is usually assumed that the victims used in such rituals were black.

12

Basile was also worshipped elsewhere in Attica, but nothing is known of the kind of sacrifices she received at those locations.

13

14

In the sacrificial calendar of the *genos* of the Salaminioi, there is one holocaust of a sheep to Ioleos.

14

This sacrifice took place in Mounychion (no date is specified) at a

major festival of the Salaminioi. On the same occasion, Herakles received an ox and Kouroutrophos a goat; Alkmene, Maia, Ion (every second year) and the Hero at the Hale all received a sheep each, while the Hero at Antisara and the Hero at Pyrgilion were each given a piglet. All these victims must have been eaten.

15

Just like Basile, Ioleos also received sacrifices at other locations in Attica. The sacrificial calendar from Marathon prescribes a sheep for him without any indication that this sacrifice was a holocaust.

16

15

Van Straten has argued for the presence of a second holocaust in the Salaminioi calendar. He suggests that the sacrifice performed in the Eurysakeion (LSS 19, lines 34–36) was also a holocaust, since the priest of Eurysakes was given 13 drachmas as compensation for the leg and the skin, which he would have received from a regular sacrifice.

17

It seems strange, however, that, if the calendar listed two holocausts, one was explicitly called *holokautos* (to Ioleos), while in the other case there was no term of that kind. Ferguson, in the publication of the text, offered a different explanation of the financial compensation of the priest. Private sacrifices, other than those performed by the *genos* to Eurysakes, also took place in this shrine. The 13 drachmas was a compensation given to the priest, since, at these private sacrifices, if the officiating priest was someone other than the priest of Eurysakes, he received the leg and the skin, and therefore the priest of Eurysakes was given financial compensation.

18

Furthermore, the priest of Eurysakes cannot have received the skin of the victim sacrificed by the *genos* to Eurysakes (line 87), since that victim was a pig, an animal which was only singed and not flayed, and therefore yielded no hide.

19

16

The victims used for holocausts were not of the most expensive kind. The piglets listed in the Thorikos and Erchia inscriptions cost 3 drachmas each, and the lamb sacrificed to Basile was also among the cheaper victims (7 drachmas). The sheep burnt whole to Ioleos cost 15 drachmas, which places it in the more expensive category of

sheep: the cheaper ones usually cost between 10 and 12 drachmas.

20

Still, this sheep was far less expensive than the cattle or pigs mentioned elsewhere in the Salaminioi inscription, which cost 70 and 40 drachmas respectively (see further discussion on prices below, pp. 163–166).

1.2. Blood rituals

17

Rituals with emphasis on the blood are very rare in the epigraphical evidence concerning hero-cults. The rituals connected with blood described by terms with the root *sphag-* are not documented at all for sacrifices to heroes in the inscriptions dating to the period of interest here.

21

18

The only epigraphical instance of a blood ritual is to be found in a mid-4th-century inscription from Thasos regulating the honours given to the *Agathoi*, the men who had died in battle for their country.

22

They will be given a worthy funeral, their names will be inscribed publicly and their fathers and children will be invited when the state sacrifices to the *Agathoi* (καλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν τοὺς πατέρας καὶ τοὺς παῖδας ὅταν ἡ πόλις ἐντέμνηι τοῖς Ἀγαθοῖς, lines 9–11) and be given seats of honour at the games. Furthermore, there will be financial compensation for the sons and daughters of the *Agathoi*.

19

The term for the sacrifice is *entemnein*, a technical term meaning to cut the throat of the animal victim, without any bearing on what was done with the meat afterwards.

23

Even though no other term is used for the sacrificial activity in the Thasian inscription, this sacrifice to the *Agathoi* is likely to have been followed by a banquet, since the fathers and the sons are explicitly invited to come there.

24

To invite the relatives of these war dead to attend a ceremony at which the animal victims were simply killed and destroyed and then

to send them home empty-handed would seem strange, particularly since the sacrifice was part of the compensation for the relatives of those killed in war. Moreover, the financial compensation given to each of them was the same as that given to the *timouchoi*, citizens receiving particular benefits, which seem to have included, among other things, contributions of food for a certain time or permanently.

25

20

The ritual may rather have consisted of an animal sacrifice at which the victims were killed and bled, and the blood perhaps poured on the tomb of the *Agathoi*.

26

After the *entemnein* sacrifice had been concluded, the meat of the victims was treated as at a *thysia* and eaten by the participants, among whom the relatives of the *Agathoi* occupied a prominent position.

1.3. Theoxenia

21

In modern scholarship, the term *theoxenia* is used for a whole set of rituals connected with the offerings of food, but the term is actually quite rare in the ancient sources.

27

The term Ἡροξείνια is found in a late-4th-century inscription from Thasos.

28

The text is a regulation listing in chronological order a number of festivals during which it was not allowed to take certain legal proceedings

29

The *Heroxeinia* is likely to have been a major festival at Thasos, since it is listed together with other important festivals, such as the *Apatouria*, the *Anthesteria* and the *Dionysia*. Judging from the name and by analogy with *theoxenia*, *Heroxeinia* must have meant a feast for the heroes to which they were invited to come and dine.

30

The practicalities of this festival are unknown.

31

22

In the case of the *Heroxeinia*, the ritual is recognised from the name of the festival. In other instances, it is the equipment mentioned that indicates that the *theoxenia* took place. A 4th-century BC inscription from the Athenian Agora lists the belongings of a nameless hero: a double-headed couch, a mattress, a bedspread, a smooth rug, four pillows, two kinds of cloths and a number of silver vessels.

32

These items may have been used for ritual dining by the worshippers in connection with the cult. The single couch, on which two people could recline, was perhaps used by the priest or some of the more prominent participants. However, it is more likely, owing to the fact that the equipment could be used by so few, that it was utilized in a *theoxenia* ceremony for the hero. The contents of the shrine correspond to the objects depicted in the reliefs showing banqueting heroes.

33

23

In most cases, the inscriptions mention simply the *trapezai* (tables) and, more rarely, a *kline* (couch). The term *trapeza* should not be taken to refer to the table itself, but to the offerings that were placed upon it.

34

These could consist of one or several portions of the meat from the *thysia* victim, either cooked or raw, if such a sacrifice was performed on the same occasion, or of other kinds of food, as well as perhaps vessels and crowns.

35

The preparation of the table could be seen as an action aimed at inviting the hero to come and participate in the sacrifice as an honoured guest.

36

The offerings on the table probably went to the priest and were subsequently eaten.

37

24

The two inscriptions mentioned above seem to refer to a sacrifice in which a meal and an invitation for the hero to come and dine were the main purpose. A *thysia* sacrifice, including dining by the worshippers, may have been performed on the same occasion, but the

theoxenia was the more important ritual.

38

In most cases in which *theoxenia* is found in the epigraphical record concerning hero-cults, the ritual was combined with animal sacrifice and seems to have functioned as an addition to the *thysia*. The hero received both a *thysia* and *theoxenia* and the whole ritual was concluded with a meal. This is the case in a 5th-century, orgeonic decree concerning the worship of the Heros Echelos and his Heroines.

39

On the first day of the celebrations, a piglet was sacrificed to the Heroines and to the Hero a full-grown victim, a *teleon*, which in all probability meant a sheep.

40

A table was also prepared for the Hero, *τράπεζαν παρατιθέναι*. On the following day, the Hero received a second *teleon* (line 16). The meat from the victims was distributed among the *orgeones* (see below, pp. 140–141).

25

A similar use of *trapezai* in connection with animal sacrifices is found in the sacrificial calendar from Marathon. When the Hero at *-rasileia* received a sheep costing 12 drachmas, he was also given a *trapeza* worth 1 drachma.

41

Similarly, the Hero at Hellotion got a sheep for 12 drachmas and a 1-drachma table.

42

An anonymous couple consisting of a Hero and a Heroine each received a piglet costing 3 drachmas, as well as a joint *trapeza* worth 1 drachma.

43

From this pricing, it is clear that whatever was put on the table must have been additional to the sacrificed animal, since the *trapeza* had its own cost. However, a portion of meat from the *thysia* could still have been placed on the table.

44

26

From the Marathon calendar, it is evident that the *trapeza* was a cheaper kind of sacrifice than a *thysia*. In the Thorikos calendar, the *trapezai* are also combined with animal sacrifices to heroes, but to different recipients. The tables were given to the less important

recipients, all of whom were heroines, while their male counterparts received animal victims, such as sheep, piglets or cows.

45

27

The use of a *trapeza* as a parallel offering to a less important deity at a *thysia* sacrifice to another divinity also seems to be found in the combination of heroes and gods. In a fragmentary Athenian list of sacrifices, dating to c. 430 BC, a table is mentioned three times.

46

In lines 4–7, a *trapeza* is mentioned, as well as the spreading of something over a couch or perhaps a throne. Eros and Hippolytos are named, and probably also Aphrodite.

47

Jameson suggests that in all of these three groups of deities, where *trapezai* are found, an animal sacrifice was prescribed for the major divinity, in this case Aphrodite, while the less important characters, Eros and Hippolytos, received the table and the couch.

48

A similar case is an early-5th-century sacrificial calendar, which prescribed the sacrifice of a kid to Dionysos, while Semele received a *trapeza*.

49

28

The offering of bloodless gifts should also be considered here, since these were commonly used at *theoxenia*. Various kinds of food, for example, bread, cakes, fruit, grain, oil and wine, could be offered and either placed on the altar or on a separate table. The mention of such edible matters does not automatically mean that a *theoxenia* took place; it may be a reference to the *hiera*, the additional offerings that were burnt in the sacrificial fire.

50

29

Explicit references to this kind of offering to heroes are fairly rare in the epigraphical evidence. A fragmentary decree from the deme Kollytos mentions that the gods and the heroes were to be given *popana* and *pelanos*.

51

This offering was perhaps preceded by an animal sacrifice, since a *thysia* is mentioned earlier in the inscription (line 8). Furthermore, the expenses for the sacrifices may have been as much as 30

drachmas ([πό] πανα καὶ πελανδ[ν καὶ τᾶλλα ᾗ δεῖ ἀπὸ δραχμῶντριάν]οντα, lines 12–13), a very large sum did the sacrifice consist only of cakes. Similarly, two anonymous heroes in an early Athenian, sacrificial calendar received two measures of wheat.

52

The bloodless offerings are described in more detail in a mid-4th-century sacrificial calendar from Kos, which may concern sacrifices to heroes, depending on how the text is restored.

53

Three sheep (*telea*) are to be sacrificed, and one measure of barley groats, one measure of mixed wheat and barley, three kylikes and a tray (*pínax*) are to accompany each victim. These extras are called *hiera* and were probably burnt in the altar fire as additional offerings to the *thysia*, but it is possible that this practice was equivalent to the preparation of tables with food at a *thysia*.

54

30

Finally, raw meat could also be deposited on a table, a ritual usually called *trapezomata*.

55

Here, the table was principally used for presenting and displaying the priest's share of the meat. At a sacrifice to a heroine mentioned in a law of a deme or a tribe from the early 4th century BC, a thigh, a part of the side near the hip with the surrounding meat, and half of the head of the victim stuffed with guts were deposited on a *trapeza*.

56

This meat was subsequently taken by the priestess.

1.4. *Thysia* sacrifices followed by dining

1.4.1. Direct evidence for dining

31

Greek inscriptions relating to sacrifices, whether those to the gods or those to the heroes, rarely stated that the ritual was to be concluded with a meal, at which the meat from the animal was to be eaten. There are many other indications of the animal being available for consumption, for example, regulations for the division of the meat between the participants, stipulations of the perquisites of the priest in the form of portions of meat and the skin, prescriptions that the

meat could not be taken out of the sanctuary (*ou phora*) and mentions of dining facilities and dining personnel.

32

The most obvious evidence for meals in hero-cults is when the inscriptions comment upon how the meat is to be handled after the animal has been killed. One of the earliest inscriptions providing this kind of information is a decree of the *orgeones* of the Hero and the Heroines dating to the mid 5th century BC and mentioned earlier in the discussion of the *Theoxenia*.

57

This association of *orgeones* had a host who performed the sacrifice, τὸν ἐστιάτορα θύειν τὴν [θυσί]αν once a year, on the 17th and the 18th of Hekatombaion. On the first day, a piglet was sacrificed (*thyein*) to the Heroines and a full-grown victim, *teleon*, to the Hero, which in all probability meant a sheep (lines 14–16).

58

For the Hero a table, *trapeza*, was also prepared. The following day, the Hero received a second, full-grown victim. The decree ends with the detailed description of the distribution of the meat by the host to the *orgeones* and members of their families (lines 17–23). *Orgeones* who were present each received a full portion of meat. There is some disagreement among the commentators on how the rest of the meat was divided, but the sons and the women of the *orgeones* seem to have received at least half a portion of meat each.

59

33

In his publication of the inscription, Meritt stressed the chthonian nature of Echelos (as the Hero was named in the 3rd century), which he considered to be further underlined by his being worshipped by a group of *orgeones* and by the fact that a piglet was sacrificed to the Heroines connected with Echelos.

60

This statement is surprising, since *thysia* here definitely refers to an alimentary sacrifice, at which the distribution of the meat was carefully regulated. Furthermore, the *hieron* of Echelos and the Heroines, at least in the 3rd century BC, may have had a *bomos*, the kind of altar usually assumed to be characteristic of Olympian, rather than chthonian, cults.

61

The interpretation of the Hero/Echelos as chthonian depends, of course, on how “chthonian” is defined, but it cannot be done on the basis of what we know of the sacrifices performed in his cult, since they show all the signs of being what is commonly called Olympian.

34

The division of meat is rarely as explicit as in the decree of the Hero and the Heroines. In the deme Skambonidai, the citizens, and also the *metoikoi*, could receive meat, when sacrifices were performed to the hero Leos.

62

The animal sacrificed was a *teleon*, i.e., probably a sheep, and the portions handed out were probably worth two or three obols each.

63

35

Other instances of a division of the meat at the sacrifices to heroes are to be found in the mid-4th-century sacrificial calendars of the *genos* of the Salaminioi and of the deme Erchia, which will both be further discussed below. In the calendar of the Salaminioi, it is stipulated that, when the sacrifices to the gods and the heroes are performed, the raw flesh should be equally divided between the two branches of the *genos*.

64

In the Erchia calendar, it is stated that the women were to receive the meat from the goat sacrificed to Semele on the 16th of Elaphebolion. This sacrifice took place on the altar (*bomos*) of Dionysos and the women were also given the meat sacrificed to this god on the same day.

65

36

In other cases, particular portions of meat are specified for certain persons as a reward for their contributions. A group calling themselves the Paraloi worshipped Paralos, who most likely had a sanctuary in Piraeus. In two decrees passed by the Paraloi after 350 BC, a member of the group is honoured by receiving a *meris* (meat-portion) Parálwi when the Paraloi θ[ύ]ωσι τ[ῶι] Παράλωι.

66

37

The perquisites of the priest, usually the skin and/or certain parts of the animal, are also specified at some hero-sacrifices. The share given

to the priest is carefully regulated in a 4th-century inscription from Oropos, concerning sacrifices made to Amphiaraos as a thanksgiving, either after effective incubation or in fulfilment of a vow.

67

The sacrificial animal could be of any kind, but no meat was to be taken out of the sanctuary. After the prayer, the sacred share should be placed on the *bomos* (κατεύχεσθαι δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἐπιτιθεῖν , lines 25–26) and the skin belonged to the sanctuary. The priest received as payment one shoulder of each victim from private sacrifices: when the festival of Amphiaraos took place, the priest's share came from the public victims.

38

Another sacred law from a deme or a tribe in Attica specifies that the priestess of the Heroine (unnamed) should get, as her priestly perquisites (*hierosyna*), five drachmas and, among other things, the skins from at least some of the victims and portions of meat, , δεισίας χρεών.

68

From the *trapeza*, the table where offerings were deposited, she also received certain parts of the meat.

69

In the Salaminioi calendar, several priestly perquisites are specified. The priest of the Hero at the Hale was given the skin and a leg of the animals sacrificed to that hero.

70

The priest of Herakles at Porthmos at Sounion, where the Salaminioi had their Herakleion, received the skin and the leg of animals that were flayed, the leg of the pigs, which were singed and did not yield any skin, and from the oxen he was to be given nine pieces of meat and the skin.

71

This priest must have performed all the sacrifices offered by the Salaminioi at Porthmos, including those offered to the other heroes worshipped there in connection with Herakles, and was therefore also given parts of the animals from the sacrifices to these heroes.

72

In the sacrificial calendar from Erchia, the priestesses of the Heroines at Schoinos, of the Heroines at Pylon and of Semele received the skins of the animals sacrificed.

73

The two groups of anonymous heroines received sheep, while Semele was given a goat. According to a sacrificial calendar from Kos, dating from the mid 4th century, the priestess of Leukothea had the right to take portions of meat from the sacrifice.

74

A very fragmentary inscription from Thasos seems to mention portions allotted to the priest at sacrifices to an unnamed hero and to Dionysos.

75

39

The evidence reviewed so far deals mainly with the division of the meat, which seems to have been by no means an unimportant activity to regulate. To this context can be added the specification that the meat was not to be taken out of the sanctuary, which must have meant that it was consumed within that area.

76

This kind of restriction is found in the sacrificial regulation concerning the cult of Amphiaraos at Oropos, dating to the non-Attic period of the sanctuary; “there is to be no carrying away of the meat outside the sanctuary”.

77

In the calendar from Erchia, seven of the eleven sacrifices to heroes are marked as οὐ φορὰ (the Heroines at Pylon, Semele, Herakleidai, Aglauros, Leukaspis, Menedeios and the Heroines at Schoinos).

78

40

The opposite restriction, namely that the meat had to be sold, is perhaps indicated in the sacrificial calendar from Thorikos.

79

Neantias received a *teleon* at the Pyanopsia festival. After this entry, the line breaks off and only the letter P is preserved, which Parker restored as π[ρατόν] (“to be sold”).

80

Also the skins of victims sacrificed to heroes could be sold, as was the case of the hides from the animals sacrificed at the Theseia.

81

41

Facilities for dining in the sanctuary of a hero are specified in a lease, established by the *orgeones* of the hero Egretes.

82

The *orgeones* leased the *hieron* and the *oikiai* to a private person for ten years (lines 1–7). When they performed the annual sacrifice to the hero, ὅταν δὲ θύωσιν οἱ ὀργεῶνες τῷ ἥρωι, the tenant was to let them use the *oikia* housing the *hieron*, which was to be opened up, two other structures called the *stégē* and the *Äptáñion*, as well as κλίνας καὶ τραπέζας εἰς δύο τρίκλινα (lines 26–30). *Stege* means a roofed place of some kind and was perhaps a small stoa or portico, or a temporary shed or shelter, while the *optanion* was the kitchen.

83

The couches and the tables may have been placed in the *stegē* and provided reclining space for 12 to 30 people depending on how many used each couch.

84

If there was not enough space to house all the worshippers, the remaining ones could have dined under the trees growing in the sanctuary.

85

42

The mention of an *hestiator* or host can be taken as an indication that the cult included dining, judging from the use and meaning of the term in the inscription regarding the cult of the Hero and the Heroines mentioned above (LSS 20) and in the literary sources.

86

Two *histiatores* (a variant spelling of *hestiatores*) are known from a decree of a group of *orgeones* dating from the late 4th century BC.

87

The decree honours two persons who have performed that duty and taken care of the affairs and the sacrifices (*thysiai*) of the association. This inscription was found in the Amyneion, west of the Acropolis, and must concern the cult of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion.

88

43

IG II² 1252, a decree dating from the mid 4th century, gives a further indication that the cult of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion included dining. The decree honours two members of the association for their achievements. They would each be given money for a *thysia* and a votive offering (lines 12–14). They were also to have ἀτέλειαν χοῦ χοῦ (line 11), which Körte interpreted as meaning that they would be granted an exemption from bringing wine to the sacrifices.

89

The substantial, mid-4th-century, sacrificial calendar from Kos, remarked upon previously in connection with Leukothea, may also concern sacrifices to other heroes, depending on the restoration of the text.

90

If the restoration of the recipients as heroes is correct, the three heroes, in the names of the three tribes in the city, received annual sacrifices in three different sanctuaries. Each hero was given a sheep (*teleon*). The officials who performed the sacrifice (τοὶ ἱεροποιοὶ καὶ θύοντι) were also to provide ἕρᾱ in the form of one measure of barley groats, one measure of mixed wheat and barley, three kylikes and a tray (πίναξ) for each of the victims (lines 5–8). Presumably these *hiera* were burnt in the sacrificial fire on the altar, a ritual forming a part of a normal *thysia* sacrifice.

91

The *pinax* may have been used for carving, and perhaps also for displaying, the meat from the sacrificed sheep.

92

Veyne, however, identified the *pinax* with a signboard, carried in the sacrificial procession, on which the name of the tribe performing the sacrifice was written.

93

45

To sum up, the inscriptions discussed above give clear evidence that the animals sacrificed in these hero-cults were not destroyed but eaten by the worshippers (or perhaps sold), either in the sanctuary or elsewhere. The texts mention the division and handling of the meat, the *histiatores* (hosts), the perquisites for priest and priestesses (skins and portions of meat), the restrictions on where the meat might be eaten and the facilities for dining. In the cases in which a term is used for the sacrificial activity, it is *thyein* or *thysia*, but it should be noted that in some inscriptions no particular term is mentioned (this will be further discussed below in connection with the four, well-preserved, Attic sacrificial calendars).

1.4.2. Circumstantial evidence for dining

46

Other inscriptions in which sacrifices to heroes are mentioned are

not as explicit as those discussed so far, but it can still be argued that the meat of the animal was available for consumption. Some of these inscriptions are very concise and give little information, apart from the name of the recipient, the kind of victim and sometimes the price.

47

The context in which these sacrifices to heroes are found and, more specifically, the company in which the heroes occur, offer guidance on what kind of ritual was used. According to the epigraphical evidence, some sacrifices to heroes and to gods were performed on the same occasion, with no indications that there were any ritual distinctions. In the case of the sacrifices to gods, it is usually assumed that the consumption of the meat was so self-evident that it did not have to be mentioned. If no other information is provided, the sacrifice must have been of the regular *thysia* kind. Since the sacrifices to the heroes, taking place on the same occasion, are not marked as being in any way different from those to the gods, they, too, should be considered as being *thysia* sacrifices, followed by dining.

48

This is clearly the case with the various heroes worshipped at Eleusis. IG I3 5, for example, dating from about 500 BC, contains a *résumé* of sacrifices performed when the initiates arrived at Eleusis.

94

The only verb for the ritual activity is. θ[ύε] ν (line 2). Hermes Enagonios and the Charites are given a goat, Poseidon a ram, and Artemis a goat. Telesidromos and Triptolemos probably received a ram.

95

To Plouton, Iakchos

96

and the two goddesses, there is sacrificed a τρίπτοα βόαρχος, i.e., a bovine, a pig and a sheep. This sacrifice of three animals was given jointly to the four recipients and there is no indication that different kinds of rituals were performed.

49

In the First Fruit Decree from Eleusis (around 422 BC), IG I³ 78 (LS 5), lines 39–40, Triptolemos, Theos, Thea and Eubouleus receive a full-grown victim each. Here, too, only one verb, *thyein*, is used for the sacrificial activity (line 36). In another First Fruit Decree from the

mid 4th century BC, IG II² 140 (LSS 13), Zeus, Demeter, Kore, Triptolemos, Theos, Thea and Eubouleus are given a *hiereion* each (lines 20–23).

50

One of the fragments connected with the recodification of the Athenian state calendar by Nichomachos at the end of the 5th century lists sacrifices performed to both gods and heroes by the *genos* of the Eumolpidai at Eleusis.

97

The term for the sacrifice [júousin] was probably *thyein*, Εὐμολπ[ίδαι] ταῦτα [θύουσιν] (lines 73–74). The first four recipients are gods, Themis, Zeus Herkeios and Demeter receiving sheep and Pherrephatte receiving a ram.

98

Next come Eumolpos, Melichos the hero, Archegetes, Polyxenos, Threptos, Dioklos and Keleos, who all receive a sheep each, apart from Threptos, who is given a ram.

99

51

In a similar fashion, the sacrifices to gods and heroes are mixed in the sacrificial calendars from Thorikos, Marathon and Erchia and of the *genos* of the Salaminioi, which will be discussed in detail further on. However, it can be pointed out also here that, in the sacrificial calendar of the *genos* of the Salaminioi, the gods and the heroes are mentioned as an entity. In two passages, it is stated that the Salaminioi are to sacrifice to the gods and the heroes, , θύεν δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσιν.

100

The sacrifices are listed in chronological order, and there is no particular information on the rituals, either for those of the gods or for those of the heroes, apart from the fact that one of the hero-sacrifices was to be a holocaust, specified in connection with this particular sacrifice.

101

In the sacrificial calendar of the deme Marathon, the series of annual and biennial sacrifices are initiated with the term *thyein*.

102

For the individual sacrifices, no particular regulations are prescribed.

52

A fragmentary decree from the deme of Kollytos also mentions joint

sacrifices to both gods and heroes.

103

Finally, among the questions posed to the oracle of Zeus at Dodona and recorded on lead tablets are inquiries about which of the gods or the heroes one was to sacrifice (*thyein*) and pray to in order to fare well.

104

53

In the inscriptions discussed so far under the heading *Circumstantial evidence for dining*, there are no indications of the victims sacrificed to the heroes being treated in a particular fashion, apart from those few cases in which specific ritual instructions are given, for example, the holocausts recorded in the Erchia and Salaminioi calendars. The most plausible interpretation, therefore, must be that, when the sacrifices to heroes and to gods are mentioned together, they were of the same kind and ended with dining.

54

The company in which the heroes were worshipped can thus help us to understand what kind of sacrifices were used. Another indicator concerns who performed the sacrifices and for what purpose. The war dead *Agathoi* worshipped on Thasos received a sacrifice that contained a blood ritual, since the term for the sacrifice is *entemnein*. Still, the whole ritual was aimed at compensating the families of the fallen for their loss and one essential part of the compensation must have been a banquet for those who attended the ceremony.

105

55

Other heroes, documented in the epigraphical material as receiving sacrifices, were worshipped by small cult-associations meeting once a year to sacrifice. The *orgeones* of the hero Egretes mentioned above (IG II² 2499 = LS 47) leased his *hieron* to a private person for ten years, on the condition that they would have access to it for their annual celebration in Boedromion. This sacrifice ended with a meal taking place in the sanctuary, which was equipped with a kitchen, couches and tables (see above, p. 144). Egretes has a very close parallel in Hypodektes, who is also known from only one inscription dating from the end of the 4th century BC

106

This is also a lease, by which the *orgeones* of Hypodektes permanently

let out his *temenos*, containing a *hieron* (line 4) and an *oikia* (line 11), to a private person for an unspecified use. The *orgeones* performed a sacrifice (*thysia*) to Hypodektes on the 14th of Boedromion, when the *hieron* was to be opened and garlanded at dawn and his statue oiled and unveiled (lines 6–9). Hypodektes is called *theos* in the inscription (line 20).

56

Hypodektes and Egretes both had substantial cult-places, where the *orgeones* gathered once a year to perform the sacrifices. In the case of Egretes they must have dined in the sanctuary, since equipment for this activity was available there. The *orgeones* of Hypodektes probably did the same, since his cult-place contained an *oikia*, where the worshippers could have been housed. Thus, classification of Hypodektes as a god and Egretes as a hero has no relation to the kind of sacrifices performed. Why, then, are they labelled differently? Ferguson suggested that *theos* was a honorific appellation given to Hypodektes.

107

It is possible that the *orgeones* could decide by themselves what to call the focus of their cult. Perhaps the *orgeones* of Hypodektes were a more prominent group than those of Egretes and therefore they labelled Hypodektes a god. A sign of his importance was the fact that he had a statue, which was oiled and unveiled as a part of the ritual. Even if Egretes had had a statue, it was not considered important enough to be mentioned in the inscription.

108

57

Other cases of cult-associations are the *orgeones* of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion, already commented upon previously, and the *thiasotai* of Tynabos, who, in a honorary decree, venerate members of the group, because they have taken care of the *thysiai* and other matters.

109

Ferguson, in his study of the Attic *orgeones*, emphasized that the major feature of the cult practised by these associations was the sacrifice and the meal which followed. There is no sign of what he calls chthonian rituals and sacrifices, and he finds that a holocaust was unthinkable and unheard of.

110

58

It remains to consider the inscriptions, in which the sacrifices to heroes are simply mentioned without any additional information or in no particular context. Among these are included many of the sacrifices to heroes found in the well-preserved, sacrificial calendars from Thorikos, Marathon, Erchia and of the Salaminioi. These will be treated further below.

59

In *IG I³ 255*, a list of rituals, including sacrifices and the shares given to priests, dating to c. 430 BC, the heroes Glaukos and Xouthos each receive a lamb.

111

To Erechtheus, a ram and also a bull were sacrificed.

112

Two anonymous heroes, defined as the Heroes in the field, were each given a full-grown victim (*teleon*).

113

We can only speculate on how these sacrifices were performed, but since no particular ritual actions are indicated, there is no reason to assume that they were not of a *thysia* kind.

60

A more doubtful case of a sacrifice to a hero is found in a law of the Delphic Amphictyony, dating from 380/79 BC.

114

The relevant line in the new edition by Rougemont reads ἐνέστω[τ]οῦ βοὸς τιμὰ τοῦ ἥρωος, ἐκατὸν στατήρες A ἱγινᾶῖοι, Rougemont suggests the following translation: “... were is found(?). Cost of the bull of the hero(?). 100 Aiginetan stateres”. He finds the line unclear and the expression τοῦ βοὸς τοῦ ἥρωος. completely obscure. Two explanations are suggested, either “the hero bull”, i.e., an extremely fine bull, or the hero should be taken as a complement to the bull, which could perhaps mean that the bull was sacrificed to the hero, but it is far from certain.

115

1.5. Four Athenian sacrificial calendars: A comparison

The Athenian sacrificial calendars offer a wealth of information concerning Greek sacrifices, both to heroes and to gods. The four best-preserved calendars, those of the demes Thorikos, Erchia and Marathon, and that of the *genos* of the Salaminioi, all of which have been partly commented upon above, will be more fully discussed together in this section (for the texts, see the Appendix, pp. 343–355).

116

In these calendars, a substantial number of heroes are mentioned and a closer study of these inscriptions can provide a context for the sacrifices to heroes, both concerning the relation between various kinds of heroes and between heroes and gods.

Of the other known calendars from Attica, which are more fragmentary, *LSS* 10 A and *IG* II² 1357 have been discussed previously. The fragmentary calendars of the demes Eleusis and Teithras do not mention any sacrifices to heroes.

117

It is clear from the better-preserved calendars that heroes generally received fewer sacrifices than the gods and the lack of heroes in the Eleusis and Teithras calendars is probably best explained by the coincidence of preservation.

The four calendars in question here are spread in time over a period of almost a hundred years. The Thorikos calendar is dated to about 430,

118

the Marathon calendar to c. 400–350,

119

the Erchia calendar to c. 375–350,

120

and the calendar of the *genos* of the Salaminioi to 363/2 BC.

121

The fastidious character of the calendars is obvious and it is interesting to see which kind of information is included and how it is arranged. In all the calendars, the sacrifices are arranged by month, but only the Erchia calendar specifies the dates properly.

122

The name of the recipient and the kind of victim are listed in each

case. Prices for the victims are given in the Marathon, Erchia and Salaminioi calendars and for two of the sacrifices in the Thorikos calendar, both being to heroes.

123

Modern studies have emphasized that one of the prime reasons for inscribing the sacrificial calendars was to regulate the financial responsibilities, rather than to give instructions to the worshippers.

124

As Jameson comments, “The ritual information is precious, but it is incidental, even casual”.

125

65

Still, the calendars offer a great amount of information on sacrificial practices. If their prime purpose was to deal with financial matters, it seems plausible to argue that only such ritual indications were given as deviated from the regular procedures, understood by everyone. What was regular practice did not have to be specified, in contrast to any particular ritual behaviour. For example, the Erchia calendar mentions only the prerogatives of the priestesses, but not those of the priests. Dow has argued that the priestesses were mentioned in order to make sure they received their share and that, in those cases in which no specification is made, the recipient of the hide of the animal is likely to have been the priest.

126

1.5.1. Heroes versus gods

66

The first observation to be made is that there is no indication of the separation of the sacrifices to the heroes from the sacrifices to the gods. The sacrifices are listed in chronological order, no matter whether the recipient is a hero or a god. However, as regarded the actual number of sacrifices, the heroes generally received less attention than the gods. They were given fewer sacrifices or, in total, less money was spent on them, as can be seen from the table below.

Table 24. Number of sacrifices to heroes and gods and the amount of money spent in the sacrificial calendars of Thorikos, Marathon, Erchia and the *genos* of the Salaminioi.

Calendar	Sacrifices to heroes	Cost in drs	Sacrifices to gods	Cost in drs
Thorikos	23	(80–100) drs	31	–
Marathon (1) (2)	22	354 drs	17	314 drs
	23	366 drs	23	366 drs
Erechia	11	99 drs	45	422 drs
Salaminiotai	12	166.5 drs	10	262.5 drs
Total incl. Thorikos	68 or 69	–	103 or 109	–
Total excl. Thorikos	45 or 46	619.5 drs or 631.5 drs	72 or 78	998.5 drs or 1050.5 drs

Since prices are given only for two sacrifices in the Thorikos calendar, these have been excluded in the summaries of the costs. For the calculation of the various items, see the discussion on the individual calendars, below. The numbers (1) and (2) for the Marathon calendar relate to the alternative years, including biennial sacrifices (see further explanation under the Marathon calendar, p. 159).

67

If the number of sacrifices in all the four calendars are added, it is clear that the heroes received a little less than 40 % of all the sacrifices that were performed. If the amounts of money spent are compared (which excludes the Thorikos calendar), the percentage is more or less the same: the cost of the sacrifices to the heroes was c. 38 % of the budget. This distribution illustrates that, even though the gods are likely to have been considered as being the more prominent and powerful, the heroes occupied an important position as recipients of sacrifices. The importance of the heroes is further underlined, if the average costs of a sacrifice to a hero and a sacrifice to a god are estimated (excluding Thorikos). The average amount spent on the hero was 14 drachmas, just the same as the average for a sacrifice to a god. Even though heroes often received fewer sacrifices in absolute numbers, each sacrifice was of no less value than the sacrifices to the gods. If each calendar is studied on its own, the proportions vary for the numbers and costs of sacrifices, to the heroes and to the gods, a fact which will be commented on below.

68

The calendars provide us with a context which makes it possible to discern how the sacrifices to heroes functioned in a larger framework. Therefore, the four calendars offer us different kinds of opportunities to evaluate the assumption that hero-sacrifices meant destruction of the animal victim and that no meat was eaten. If the

meat from the animals sacrificed to heroes was considered unfit for consumption, this would mean that more than a third of the animals slaughtered could not be eaten. Such an interpretation seems unlikely for several reasons.

69

First of all, animal sacrifice, and especially the dining which followed, fulfilled an important role in ancient Greek society as a means of strengthening the social ties between the citizens and also as a means of indicating who did belong and who did not. Whitehead, in his study of the Attic demes, has shown that there were three categories of deme sacrifices, depending on who could have a share in the *hiera*: (1) *hiera* which could be shared by outsiders, (2) *hiera* which could not be shared by outsiders, and (3) *hiera* in which others besides the demesmen were regularly included.

127

The interpretation that more than a third of the sacrifices performed in the deme were not followed by dining fits badly into that picture.

128

70

Secondly, if all the victims sacrificed to heroes were destroyed, a third of the money spent would literally have gone up completely in smoke, without making any meat available for the worshippers. Such a waste of meat seems highly implausible, considering the scarcity of meat in antiquity and the fact that, as far as we can tell, virtually all the meat eaten seems to have come from animals killed at sacrifices.

129

71

Thirdly, in the discussion above on which kinds of sacrifices can be reconstructed from the epigraphical material, it was argued that only a very small number of sacrifices could be interpreted as involving the total destruction of the animal victim. These sacrifices were explicitly marked as holocausts. If we were to assume that also other, unspecified sacrifices to heroes meant a total destruction, why were not these, too, marked as being holocausts? What would be the difference between these two kinds of destruction sacrifices, i.e., between those marked as holocausts and those not marked, but only implicitly understood as holocausts? It seems more plausible to argue that, when a sacrifice differed from a regular *thysia*, that difference was marked in some way. If there is no indication of any particulars,

there is no reason to assume a difference from a regular *thysia* sacrifice.

130

72

The third point is further illustrated by the similar treatment of heroes and gods with regard to the use of ritual specifications for the various sacrifices. These specifications provide additional information regarding what was to be done with the animal or if any other kind of ritual action was to be performed. Most sacrifices listed in the four calendars have no such specifications.

131

In the Marathonian calendar, there are none at all, which seems to indicate that all the animal sacrifices were performed in the same manner, i.e., *thysia* with dining. In the Salaminioi calendar, one sacrifice is specified and in the Thorikos calendar there are six specifications. The Erchia calendar stands out clearly with 46 ritual specifications. Some sacrifices in the Erchia calendar are specified in more than one way. For example, a holocaust may also be *nephalios* (wineless) or the meat from a sacrifice can be stipulated as to be given to a certain group of people, who also had to consume it within the sanctuary. The ritual specifications are summarized in Table 25.

73

It is clear from the table that the ritual specifications are fairly evenly distributed among the sacrifices to the heroes and the gods, respectively. The predominance of ritual specifications for the sacrifices to the gods must be related to the fact that more sacrifices were performed to the gods than to the heroes (cf. Table 24).

74

In the Salaminioi calendar, the holocaust to the hero Ioleos is the only ritual specification given. In the Thorikos calendar, there is one holocaust for a god and five specifications that the meat is to be sold: one sacrifice concerning a hero and the rest concerning gods. The impression one gets from these two calendars is that it was of great interest to indicate clearly those few occasions when the meat would not be available for consumption by the worshippers. If the animal was burnt whole or the meat sold, there would be no dining. It is important to note that these sacrifices were performed both to heroes and to gods.

75

In the Erchia calendar, the giving of ritual instructions must clearly have been of the utmost importance, considering the frequency of these additions. Both the cult of the heroes and that of the gods were regulated in this manner.

76

The large number of specifications in the Erchia calendar should be compared with the fact that this calendar has no particular term for the sacrificial activity at the beginning: the listing of the sacrifices in the five columns begins immediately below the heading *Demarchia he mezon*. Apparently there was no need for a term, such as *thyein* or *thysia*, which summarized all the sacrificial activity. In the introduction to the listing of the sacrifices in the Salaminioi calendar, all the subsequent activity is summarized as τὰ ἱερὰ θύωσι αἰεὶ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσι.

132

In the Marathon calendar, the series of annual sacrifices are initiated with [ὁ Μα]ραθωνίων θύει (line B 2) and the second group of biennial sacrifices with τάδε τὸ ἕτερον ἔτος θύεται (line B 39).

133

For the Thorikos calendar, the beginning is lost, but there may have been a comprehensive sacrificial term in the part which is now missing.

Table 25. Occurrence of ritual specifications in the sacrificial calendars of Thorikos, Erchia and the *genos* of the Salaminioi.

Action	Thorikos		Erchia		Salaminioi	
	Heroes	Gods	Heroes	Gods	Heroes	Gods
Holocaust	—	1	3	1	1	—
<i>Ou phora</i>	—	—	7	15	—	—
Distribution of meat	—	—	1	4	—	—
Meat to be sold	1	4	—	—	—	—
Skin to be torn	—	—	—	2	—	—
Skin to priestess	—	—	3	2	—	—
<i>Nepheles</i>	—	—	4	4	—	—
Total	1	5	18	28	1	0

The division of the ritual specifications. The listing follows the order of the table above. References to the inscriptions: Thorikos – Daux 1983, 152–154; Erchia – LS 18; for the three cases of *ou phora* added later, see Daux 1963a, 628; Salaminioi – LSS 19. See also the Appendix, pp. 343 – 355.

Holocaust: Thorikos 15 (Zeus); Erchia col. II, 18–19 (Basile); Erchia col. IV, 22–23 (Epops); Erchia col. V, 13–14 (Epops); Erchia col. III, 23–24 (Zeus Epopes);

Salaminiot 85 (Ioleos).

Ou phora: Erchia col. I, 21 (Heroines at Pylon); Erchia col. I, 51 (Semele); Erchia col. II, 44 (Herakleidai), added later; Erchia col. II, 59 (Aglauros), added later; Erchia col. III, 53 (Leukaspis); Erchia col. IV, 55 (Menedeios); Erchia col. V, 6–7 (Heroines at Schoinos); Erchia col. I, 5 (Apollon); Erchia col. I, 10–11 (Hera Thelchinia); Erchia col. III, 6–7 (Kourotrophos); Erchia col. III, 10 (Artemis); Erchia col. III, 17–18 (Zeus Polieus); Erchia col. III, 64 (Zeus Polieus); Erchia col. IV, 6–7 (Kourotrophos); Erchia col. IV, 10–11 (Artemis); Erchia col. IV, 38 (Dionysos); Erchia col. IV, 46 (Tritopatreis); Erchia col. V, 21–22 (Ge); Erchia col. V, 26–27 (Zeus); Erchia col. V, 30 (Zeus Horios); Erchia col. V, 38 (Apollon Lykeios), added later; Erchia col. V, 63–64 (Zeus Epakrios).

Distribution of meat: Erchia col. I 48–50 (Semele); Erchia col. II, 49–50 (Apollon Pythios); Erchia col. III, 36–37 (Apollon Apotropaos); Erchia col. IV, 37–38 (Dionysos); Erchia col. V, 36–37 (Apollon Lykeios).

Meat to be sold: Thorikos 27 (Neantias); Thorikos 11–12 (Zeus Kataibates); Thorikos 23 (Athena); Thorikos 26 (Zeus Kataibates); Thorikos 35 (Zeus Milichios).

Skin to be torn: Erchia col. III, 11–12 (Artemis); Erchia col. IV, 11–12 (Artemis).

Skin to priestess: Erchia col. I, 21–22 (Heroines at Pylon); Erchia col. I, 51–52 (Semele); Erchia col. V, 7–8 (Heroines at Schoinos); Erchia col. II, 38–39 (Hera); Erchia col. IV, 39–40 (Dionysos).

Nephalios: Erchia col. II, 19–20 (Basile); Erchia col. III, 52 (Leukaspis); Erchia col. IV, 23 (Epops); Erchia col. V, 14–15 (Epops); Erchia col. I, 41–43 (Zeus Milichios); Erchia col. III, 24–25 (Zeus Epopetes); Erchia col. IV, 45–46 (Tritopatreis); Erchia col. V, 63 (Zeus Epakrios).

77

Most of the ritual specifications in the Erchia calendar are concerned with the meat: four holocausts, 22 regulations that no meat was to be taken away and five stipulations on who was to receive the meat. In Erchia, just as in Marathon and among the Salaminiot, it seems to have been important to clarify, not only when there was no meat available for consumption, but also, whether there were any restrictions on what could be done with the available meat.

78

Moreover, the specifications in the Erchia calendar are used in the same manner both for heroes and for gods. For example, the four holocausts, three to heroes and one to a god, are all to be wineless (*nephalia*). The distribution of the meat is prescribed after one sacrifice to a heroine and following four sacrifices to gods. In the case of the heroine Semele, the meat was given to the women and was to be eaten in the sanctuary. This sacrifice was performed on the same day and at the same altar (*bomos*) as the sacrifice to Dionysos, in which the meat also was given to the women and consumed in the sanctuary. Furthermore, in both cases, the priestesses received the

hide of the goats sacrificed. The only specification stipulated in the Erchia calendar that occurs only for gods and not for heroes is the tearing of the skins of the goats sacrificed to Artemis.

79

In all, although the main purpose of the calendars was to regulate economical matters, the fact remains that the main cost at a sacrifice must have been the animal victims. Admittedly, many possible ritual actions are not commented upon in these texts. This is clear if a comparison is made with the more detailed documents such as the mid-4th-century inscription from Kos or the new sacred law from Selinous. Still, what the calendars do say about ritual, and this applies both to the Attic examples as well as to other inscriptions, is principally concerned with meat: the amount available, its division, any particulars surrounding its consumption. And since the treatment of meat and the dining on meat must be viewed as a main feature of Greek religion, these documents can definitely be considered as having a bearing on the rituals practised, especially when it comes to evaluating the traditional notion of the main ritual in hero-cults being a sacrifice at which the animal was destroyed.

1.5.2. Thorikos

80

If we continue to look at each calendar separately, it is possible to discern some regional distinctions concerning the cult of the heroes. The earliest calendar is that from Thorikos.

134

81

In the Thorikos calendar, c. 40 % of the animals sacrificed were to heroes. Prices are given only for one category of victims, namely cattle, which were to cost between 40 and 50 drachmas. However, we are well informed of the prices for the other categories of animals from the other calendars and it is safe to assume that the cows or oxen were the most expensive animals sacrificed at Thorikos. Only heroes received these costly animals in this deme. One was sacrificed to the hero Thorikos (lines 28–30), the eponymous hero of the deme, while the other was offered to Kephalos (lines 54–56), a hero who was intimately connected with the deme Thorikos in myth.

135

The importance of these two heroes is further indicated by the fact that both of them also received a sheep each on another occasion during the year (lines 16–18).

Table 26. The Thorikos calendar. Type and number of animals and expenses for sacrifices to heroes and gods.

Animal	Heroes	Cost in drs	Gods	Cost in drs
Sheep	9	—	5	—
<i>Tetrapoi</i>	5	—	9	—
Lamb	—	—	4	—
Pregnant ewe	—	—	2	—
Goat	—	—	3	—
Kid	—	—	3	—
Cow or ox	2	40–50 drs	—	—
Piglet	1	—	5	—
<i>Trapeza</i>	6	—	—	—
Total	23	80–100 drs	31	—

Trapezai have been included, even though that kind of sacrifice did not include a particular victim.

Though the total number of sacrifices to heroes was less than that to the gods, it is interesting to note that the heroes mainly received substantial victims. Apart from the two cows or oxen, the heroes were given 14 grown sheep, just as many as the gods. The latter, however, also received two pregnant ewes and three goats. The remaining sacrifices to the gods were mainly made with what must have been relatively cheap animals: lambs, kids and piglets. The heroes seem either to have been considered so important that they were given substantial animals like cows or oxen and sheep or of relatively minor importance, and therefore received only a piglet or a *trapeza*, which, in all probability, did not include a particular animal victim (see above, p. 138). *Trapezai* were given only to heroines, and five of these heroines received their *trapeza* in connection with a male hero being given an animal victim: cow or ox, sheep or piglet. Some of these heroines did not even have their own names but were simply

designated after their male companion as the Heroines of (the hero) Thorikos (line 30) or the Heroines of Hyperpedios (lines 48–49).

136

1.5.3. Marathon

83

The calendar from Marathon is, in many ways, similar to that from Thorikos, concerning both the number and the type of sacrifices and their division between heroes and gods.

137

84

The sacrifices in the Marathon calendar are divided into three sections in the inscription. First are listed sacrifices performed every year (lines B 2–33), followed by two groups of sacrifices performed in alternate years (lines B 34–38 and B 39–53 respectively). In Table 27, boxes with two numbers for the animals or two kinds of prices show the differences between the alternate years. Boxes with only one number or price indicate that there was no difference between the two years. The number and kind of sacrifices given to the heroes and the gods, respectively, therefore depend on which year is being discussed. What can be noted regarding this division is that the biennial sacrifices deal almost exclusively with the gods. The sacrifices to the heroes are all found among those performed every year, with the exception of the sacrifice of a ram to Galios every two years (line B 51).

Table 27. The Marathon calendar. Type and number of animals and expenses for sacrifices to heroes and gods.

Animal		Heroes	Cost in drs	Gods	Cost in drs
Sheep, ewe, 11 drs	(1)	6	66 drs	6	66 drs
	(2)			4	44 drs
Sheep, wether, 12 drs	(1)	8	96 drs	1	12 drs
	(2)			2	24 drs
Pregnant ewe, 16 drs		—	—	1	16 drs
Ram, 12 drs	(1)	—	—	1	12 drs
	(2)	1	12 drs	2	24 drs
Goat, 15 drs		—	—	1	15 drs
Cow or ox, 90 drs	(1)	2	180 drs	1	90 drs
	(2)			1	90 drs
Pregnant cow, 90 drs		—	—	1	90 drs
Piglet, 3 drs	(1)	3	9 drs	4	12 drs
	(2)			7	21 drs
Pregnant pig, 20 drs	(1)	—	—	—	—
	(2)	—	—	2	40 drs
Trapeza, 1 dr	(1)	3	3 drs	1	1 dr
	(2)			2	2 drs
Total	(1)	22	354 drs	17	314 drs
	(2)	23	366 drs	23	366 drs

Trapezai have been included, even though that kind of sacrifice did not include a particular victim. The numbers (1) and (2) refer to the differences between sacrifices performed in alternate years (see the explanation p. 159).

For the first of the two years, the heroes receive more than the gods, both in actual numbers of victims and in the amount of money spent.

In the second year, the sacrifices to the heroes and those to the gods are more alike. The heroes receive 14 sheep and the gods six, but the gods are also given a pregnant ewe, a ram and a goat: victims within the same price range or somewhat more expensive. The cows or oxen are distributed with two for the heroes and two for the gods; however, one of the latter was specified as a pregnant cow. The piglets are more unevenly spread. The heroes were given three and the gods seven. To the gods were also sacrificed two pregnant pigs, victims that were of a more expensive kind. Even when the number of victims sacrificed was evenly divided between heroes and gods, the latter were given more unusual kinds of animals, such as pregnant females or an uncastrated male.

In some cases, a hero or a god received more than one victim on the same occasion, making the total cost of the offering exceed 100 drachmas. The hero Neanias was given a cow or ox, a sheep and a piglet, a *trittoa boarchos*, of a total cost of 105 drachmas (line B 21), and the Hero *-nechos*, received a cow or ox and a sheep, together costing 102 drachmas (line B 20). The only, more expensive group of offerings given to a single deity found in the Marathon calendar is that to Athena Hellotis (lines B 35–36). To her were sacrificed a cow or an ox, three sheep and a piglet, which altogether cost 126 drachmas. However, this expensive sacrifice to Athena Hellotis took place only every second year: in the intermediate year, Athena Hellotis was given only a sheep costing 11 drs (line B 41). The sacrifices to Neanias and *-nechos*, on the other hand, were performed every year. This comparison illustrates clearly the prominence of these heroes in this deme.

As in the Thorikos calendar, also minor heroes receiving cheap offerings are found at Marathon. For example, an unnamed Hero and his Heroine were given a piglet each, as well as a joint *trapeza* (lines B 3–4). The pairing up of a male hero and female heroine is common in many cases, apart from the one just mentioned. Both the important heroes, Neanias and *-nechos*, are each accompanied by an anonymous heroine, who receives a female sheep as sacrifice (lines B 20 and 22). The Hero at *-rasileia* is given a sheep and a *trapeza*, and his anonymous heroine a sheep (lines B 23–24). The same offerings were made to the Hero at Hellotion and his heroine, also unnamed (lines B 25–26).

1.5.4. Erchia

The Erchia calendar shows many differences, compared with the Thorikos and Marathon calendars.

In these two calendars, the sacrifices were listed for each month, with no clear indication of the day on which the ritual was to take place. Furthermore, the Marathon calendar contained no ritual specifications and the Thorikos calendar very few. In the Erchia calendar, the dates are carefully indicated and there are ample ritual

specifications for a number of sacrifices. The most striking difference, however, is the proportions of the sacrifices to the heroes and the sacrifices to the gods.

Table 28. The Erchia calendar. Type and number of animals and expenses for sacrifices to heroes and gods.

Animal	Heroes	Cost in drs	Gods	Cost in drs
Sheep, ewe, 10 drs	4	40 drs	6	60 drs
Sheep, wether, 12 drs	3	36 drs	17	204 drs
Ram, 10 drs	—	—	1	10 drs
Lamb, 7 drs	1	7 drs	3	21 drs
Goat, female, 10 drs	1	10 drs	5	50 drs
Goat, male, 12 drs	—	—	4	48 drs
Kid, 5 drs	—	—	1	5 drs
Piglet, 3 drs	2	6 drs	8	24 drs
Total	11	99 drs	45	422 drs

89

The impression one gets from the Erchia calendar is one of economy. No animals of the most expensive kind were sacrificed, such as cows or oxen or pigs. There are no pregnant animals, which also seem to have had a higher price. The cult of the gods seems to have been given precedence at the expense of the sacrifices to the heroes. Of the preserved sacrifices listed from Erchia, only a fifth were performed to heroes. They mainly received sheep, but only a total of seven, compared with 23 sheep sacrificed to the gods. Both heroes and gods were given lambs and female goats, the gods more often than the heroes. As in the Thorikos and Marathon calendars, the gods at Erchia were given a greater variety of animal victims, usually not given to the heroes: male goats, a kid and a ram.

90

The heroes that do receive worship mainly have a strong local colour, but still seem to be quite insignificant. There are two groups of heroines only identified by their toponyms, the Heroines at Pylon and the Heroines at Schoinos (col. I, 19, and col. V, 3). Alochos, Epops and Menedeios all have unknown or unclear mythology and seem to have had no known cults, apart from those documented in the Erchia calendar.

The mythological background of Leukaspis is obscure, but he may also have been worshipped at Syracuse.

Local heroes of major importance in terms of expenses for sacrifices, such as Thorikos and Kephalos at Thorikos or Neanias and *-nechos* at Marathon, are completely lacking at Erchia.

91

Dow explained the unusual division of the sacrifices in the Erchia calendar into five columns as a result of a new way of financing the sacrifices, which apparently was difficult. The calendar was re-codified and divided into five, almost equal parts, the expenses of each column were to be paid for by one demesman. Dow further suggested that there may have been more hero-sacrifices previously but that they had had to be abandoned in the 4th century.

If that assumption is correct, it would explain the low number of sacrifices to heroes at Erchia, as compared with Thorikos and Marathon.

92

It is also possible that this calendar of sacrifices was not the only one at Erchia. The heading of the calendar, Δημαρχία ἡ μὲζων, the “Greater Demarchia”, has usually been taken as an indication that there was also a “Lesser Demarchia”. Dow argued that this “Lesser Demarchia” contained the sacrifices that used to be performed in the past, before the re-codification and creation of the “Greater Demarchia”.

The “Greater Demarchia” is therefore a replacement for the former “Lesser Demarchia”. Other scholars, beginning with the publisher Daux, have argued that a “Greater Demarchia” rather presupposes a contemporary “Lesser Demarchia”.

The main argument for another contemporary calendar is the lack of any biennial or quadrennial sacrifices in the extant calendar.

If there was a second calendar at Erchia, it is possible that that calendar contained a number of sacrifices to the heroes.

The last calendar to be dealt with does not regulate the sacrifices of a deme, but of the two branches of the *genos* of the Salaminioi.

147

The whole inscription is an arbitration dealing with the common cults of the *genos* and how these are to be funded and administered. The sacrificial calendar forms only the last part of the text (lines 85–94) and lists the sacrifices that the Salaminioi paid for with the income from the lease of land at their Herakleion at Sounion. In the inscription are also mentioned sacrifices at which the victims were furnished by the state or by voluntary contributions from the individual members, but we have no information on the kinds of victims, their prices or who received them.

148

Table 29. The calendar of the *genos* of the Salaminioi. Type and number of animals and expenses for sacrifices to heroes and gods.

Animal	Heroes	Cost in drs	Gods	Cost in drs
Sheep, ewe, 12 drs	2	24 drs	1	12 drs
Sheep, wether, 15 drs	3	45 drs	–	–
Goat, 10 drs	–	–	1	10 drs
Cow or ox, 70 drs	–	–	1	70 drs
Pig, 40 drs	2	80 drs	4	160 drs
Piglet, 3.5 drs	5	17.5 drs	3	10.5 drs
Total	12	166.5 drs	10	262.5 drs

The cost of wood has not been included.

The Salaminioi calendar displays some differences when compared with the three deme calendars discussed previously. First of all, the total number of sacrifices is substantially lower than that of the other calendars. This is not surprising, however, since the Salaminioi were a *genos* and not a deme and therefore must have had less resources. Secondly, the heroes receive more sacrifices than the gods, twelve to the heroes (thirteen if the biennial sacrifice to Ion is included) and ten to the gods. This division may also be explained as being related

to the fact that the inscription concerns a *genos*, who may have been even more interested in genealogical cults than a *deme* was. Furthermore, in terms of sacrificial practices, a *genos* may be compared to an association of *orgeones*, which also focused on the cults of heroes, even though it mainly concerned itself with one, and not several, heroes.

95

Even though the heroes received more sacrifices than the gods, the sacrifices to the latter cost substantially more money. The heroes were mainly given sheep (five) and piglets (five), and the only expensive animals were two pigs costing 40 drs each. The gods receive only one sheep and one goat, but four pigs and the only cow or ox listed in the calendar.

96

Just as in the Thorikos and Marathon calendars, it is possible to distinguish various categories of heroes. Eurysakes and Theseus received pigs, the most expensive victims given to the heroes (lines 87 and 91). On the days when their sacrifices were performed, the Salaminioi seem to have made no other offerings, since each occasion has the date indicated, the 18th of Mounychion for Eurysakes and the 6th of Pyanopsion for Theseus. These festivals were apparently focused completely on the respective hero. Eurysakes had a priest and a precinct, the Eurysakeion at Melite in Athens, which is likely to have been the headquarters of the Salaminioi and where their published records were stored.

149

Theseus was, of course, a major Athenian hero, receiving worship at several locations, but the Salaminioi probably sacrificed to him in Athens or perhaps at Phaleron.

150

97

All the other heroes were worshipped together with a god or gods.

151

For example, the heroes Phaiax, Teukros and Nauseiros each received a piglet costing 3.5 drs at the same festival as when Poseidon was given a pig worth 40 drs (lines 89–91).

98

At the major festival of the Salaminioi, which took place in Mounychion at their Herakleion at Porthmos at Sounion, six heroes

(or seven, depending on the year) and two gods were given sacrifices (lines 84–87). Herakles, the main deity, received an ox, the only one in the whole calendar, and Kourotrophos a goat, also the only one in the calendar. Of the heroes, Alkmene, Maia, Ion (every second year), the Hero at the Hale and Ioleos were given sheep, but the sheep sacrificed to Ioleos was burnt in a holocaust. Finally, the Hero at Antisara and the Hero at Pyrgilion were given a piglet each. The last two heroes, identified only by their toponym, received the smallest victims. The Hero at the Hale, “the Hero of the salt-works”, was also known by his toponym but was given a sheep. This hero was probably more important, since his cult was administered by the priest of Eurysakes.

152

99

Finally, the hero Skiros received a sheep on the same occasion as Athena Skiras was given a pregnant ewe (line 92). This entry ends with the expense of 3 drs for wood for the altar (*bomos*), which presumably was used for both these sacrifices.

1.5.6. Conclusions

100

Four points can be made from this discussion of the four calendars. Before these points are outlined, it is important to remember that the calendars reflect sacrifices performed on an intermediate level of Athenian society, which, to a certain degree, was different from the religious activity of the state or from that in the private sphere, such as the family or groups of *orgeones*. Both the deities which received worship and the kind of animals sacrificed are clearly related to the fact that we are dealing with the records of demes and a *genos*.

153

101

First of all, it is evident that the most frequent ritual performed both to heroes and to gods was a sacrifice ending with dining. The terminology used for these sacrifices is *thyein* and *thysia* in the Marathon and Salaminioi calendars, but this ritual seems to have been so common that it was sufficient to use these terms in the introduction to the whole calendar or to sections of the text. The individual sacrifices did not have to be specified as *thysiai*. In the calendars from Thorikos and Erchia, the terms *thyein* and *thysia* do

not occur at all.

154

Any ritual behaviour deviating from a regular *thysia*, on the other hand, was indicated by particular terms, such as *holokautos*, *nephalios* or *ou phora*. Moreover, these ritual specifications are used both for the sacrifices to heroes and for those to gods.

102

Secondly, the interpretation of the main kind of sacrifice to the heroes as a *thysia* including dining, is strengthened by the prominent position which the heroes occupy in the calendars. The heroes were important recipients of worship, as is obvious from the actual number of sacrifices they received and the amount of money that was spent on these sacrifices, and it seems highly unlikely that such a substantial part of the sacrifices would not have ended with dining. In all four calendars, the worship of the heroes is interwoven with that of the gods throughout the year. Judging from the frequency of sacrifice and the kinds of animal victims used, the heroes must, in many cases, have been considered as just as important as the gods and in a few instances even more important. Some heroes, such as Thorikos and Kephalos at Thorikos, and Neanias and *-nechos* at Marathon, received cattle, i.e., victims of the most expensive kind. These large animals gave a substantial amount of meat, and the festivals of these heroes must have been of major importance, since a great number of people could participate.

155

Cattle were usually sacrificed only by the Athenian state, which had more substantial resources at its disposal.

156

103

Thirdly, the heroes we encounter were not all of the same kind. Some were major religious characters, such as Thorikos, Kephalos, Neanias and *-nechos* mentioned above, who may have been the eponymous hero or the *archegetes* of a deme.

157

In the Salaminioi calendar, the major hero is Eurysakes, who received an expensive victim, a pig, and whose shrine must have been the meeting-point of the *genos*, since they stored their records at that location. The large animals sacrificed to these heroes clearly emphasize their importance, and their festivals must have been

major events. On a middle level are the bulk of the heroes in the calendars. Several of these heroes are little known apart from these inscriptions. The sacrifices they receive are mainly sheep. On the lowest level, we find the heroes, who are often identified by their toponyms or simply called the Hero or the Heroine. These heroes receive piglets or the most inexpensive kind of offerings, *trapezai*.

104

Finally, there are regional variations between the calendars, regarding both the numbers of sacrifices to heroes and the animals used (see Tables 24 and 30). If we compare the three demes, it is clear that Thorikos and Marathon must be considered as having been fairly wealthy, while Erchia was more frugal. In his study of the relation between sacrifice and animal husbandry in ancient Greece, Michael Jameson has emphasized that, on this local level, the victims sacrificed correspond more or less to the seasonal supply of animals but that the local geographical conditions were also of importance.

158

On the Marathon plain, there was good pasturage for cattle and therefore the deme could sacrifice this expensive type of animal. Erchia was apparently dependent on sheep and did not sacrifice one single cow or ox. Furthermore, the Erchia calendar differs from the other three calendars regarding the low number of sacrifices to heroes: only a fifth of the total. It is possible that this deme had had difficulties in financing the sacrifices and had therefore cut down on the offerings to the heroes. However, the Erchian calendar records more sacrifices to the gods than the other calendars, and therefore it seems rather as if the Erchians gave priority to the gods over the heroes.

Table 30. Number and kind of animals sacrificed to heroes and gods in the calendars of Thorikos, Marathon, Erchia and the *genos* of the Salaminioi.

Animal	Thorikos	Marathon (1) (2)		Erchia	Salaminiot
Sheep, sex not indicated	14	—	—	—	—
Sheep, ewe	—	12	10	10	3
Sheep, wether	14	9	10	20	3
Ram	—	1	3	1	—
Lamb	4	—	—	4	—
Pregnant ewe	2	1	—	—	—
Goat, sex not indicated	3	1	—	—	1
Goat, female	—	—	—	6	—
Goat, male	—	—	—	4	—
Kid	3	—	—	1	1
Cow or ox	2	3	—	—	—
Pregnant cow	—	1	—	—	—
Pig	—	—	—	—	6
Pregnant pig	—	—	2	—	—
Piglet	6	7	10	10	8
Total	48	35	41	56	22

The numbers (1) and (2) refer to the differences between sacrifices performed alternate years, see the explanation above under the Marathon calendar, p. 159.

Bearing the regional variations in mind, it can be said that from the perspective of the deme and the *genos*, little distinction seems to have been made between gods and heroes, judging from the sacrifices performed. Admittedly, the gods as a whole received more sacrifices than the heroes, but the most important heroes must be considered as being more or less on the same level as the gods. The cheapest kinds of victims, piglets, could also be given to gods, although a preference for presenting such sacrifices to minor heroes can be noted. Any explicit need to distinguish between heroes and gods in these contexts may rather have been expressed on another level than the actual sacrifices performed. By their exclusive and individual nature, the heroes were more connected with a local community, a family or a group than the pan-Hellenic gods, worshipped not only in Athens itself but also outside Attica. Still, it has to be remembered that many of the gods occurring in these documents can by their epithets be considered as having clear local traits. The general impression remains, however, that any particular distinctions made

between heroes and gods can rarely be demonstrated from the calendars but have to be sought in other kinds of evidence.

1.6. Conclusion: Sacrifices to heroes from the epigraphical evidence

106

From the review of the epigraphical evidence for sacrifices to heroes in the Archaic to early Hellenistic periods, it is clear that there is no support for the notion that the rituals used in hero-cults were predominantly holocausts, blood libations and offerings of food. Holocausts and blood rituals are rarely indicated in the inscriptions, judging from the terminology used. If we assume that these rituals were performed also in other cases, apart from when it is explicitly stated, we are faced with the problem of deciding which of the other hero-sacrifices should be interpreted as having been holocausts or blood rituals. Furthermore, why should a handful of holocausts to heroes be specified as being of this kind, while the great majority were not? The direct evidence for *thysia* including dining is so substantial that this kind of ritual has to be assumed also in the cases in which there is no extra information, showing beyond any doubt that the meat of the animal was kept and eaten.

107

The *theo xenia* are more common than the holocausts and blood rituals but seem mainly to have functioned as a complimentary ritual used on the same occasion as a *thysia*. Either the hero receiving a *thysia* would also receive a table with offerings or the table would be presented to a less important hero or heroine at the same time as the *thysia* to the other recipient.

108

According to the epigraphical material, the standard sacrifice to heroes was a *thysia* with dining. This ritual was so frequent that it did not need any particular explanations, unless the meat or the skin was to be handled in a special manner. It was the deviating, unusual practices that had to be indicated. The basic sacrifice to a hero was a *thysia* at which the worshippers ate, just as in the cult of the gods.

2. Literary evidence

2.1. Destruction sacrifices

109

In the epigraphical material, the instances of total destruction of the animals sacrificed to heroes were covered by the term *holokautos*. In the literary sources, the verb *holokautein* and its variants are not documented at all for sacrifices to heroes and are in fact rare also in other Greek religious contexts.

159

110

The terms which the literary sources use for the hero-sacrifices in which the whole victim was destroyed are *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos*. From the investigation of the use and meaning of these terms in chapter I, it is clear that they were linked in particular to recipients who had a close connection with death and that the rituals covered consisted in a total destruction of the offerings, usually by means of fire, not leaving any meat to dine on.

111

In the period of interest here, down to 300 BC, only *enagizein* and *enagisma* are used for sacrifices to heroes in a total of four cases. Since these passages have already been discussed, only a brief summary is given here.

160

The Greek prisoners of war killed by the inhabitants of Agylla received *enagizein* sacrifices and games at the command of the Pythia.

161

These sacrifices were instituted to remedy the negative effects of the unjust killing of the Phokaians. The contents of the rituals are not described by Herodotos, but they probably included the killing of animals, since they are said to be performed *megalos* and were accompanied by athletic games and horse-races.

112

Harmodios and Aristogeiton were given *enagismata* performed by the polemarch in Athens.

162

The cult of Harmodios and Aristogeiton seems to have been close to, but not identical with, the cult of the war dead, which was also among

the responsibilities of the polemarch. The contents of the *enagismata* are not known, but animal sacrifice seems likely, considering the importance accorded to Harmodios and Aristogeiton in the abolition of the tyranny.

163

Furthermore, it seems strange that these heroes should have received less than, for example, the minor local heroes known from the sacrificial calendars of Attica.

113

The third case of *enagizein* sacrifices concerns four groups of heroes at Taras, the Atreidai, Tydeidai, Aiakidai and Laertiadai.

164

These heroes received their *enagizein* sacrifices on certain occasions, while another group of heroes, the Agamemnonidai, were given *thysiai* on another day. The *thysia* to the Agamemnonidai was followed by dining, since the text states explicitly that the women were not allowed to taste the meat. Animals were probably also sacrificed at the *enagizein* sacrifices.

114

Finally, Herakles was worshipped in two aspects, on the one hand, with *enagizein* sacrifices as a hero, and on the other, as an immortal Olympian receiving *thysia*.

165

The explicit contrasting of *thyein* and *enagizein* is best interpreted as referring to two different kinds of rituals, a sacrifice ending with dining and a destruction sacrifice, respectively.

115

The *enagizein* sacrifices to the Phokaians at Agylla, and to the Atreidai, Tydeidai, Aiakidai and Laertiadai at Taras, as well as the *enagismata* to Harmodios and Aristogeiton, were the only rituals to be performed to the heroes on each particular occasion, as far as it is possible to tell. The dual cult of Herakles, on the other hand, may have been a single entity consisting of both an alimentary and a destruction sacrifice, using either the same victim or two separate animals.

166

2.2. Blood rituals

116

The blood rituals mentioned in the literary sources are covered by a terminology more varied than that of the destruction sacrifices. The evidence for blood rituals is not abundant, though. It is interesting to note that, in all the cases of relevance to Greek conditions, the blood rituals belong to a larger complex, which also included *thysia* followed by dining. Only the blood rituals themselves are of interest here, while the contexts to which they belong and in particular the evidence for *thysia* sacrifices will be considered later in this chapter.

167

117

The first and clearest case of a blood ritual is found in Pindar's description of the cult of Pelops at Olympia, in which it is said that he has a share in the splendid offerings *mémiktai* of blood: *νῦν δ' ἐν αἵμακουρίαις ἀγλαῖσι μέμικται*.

168

Haimakouria must be considered as referring to an offering of blood.

169

This term is highly unusual and seems to have been a local Boiotian word, which, apart from this instance in Pindar, is only found once in Plutarch and in a few lexica from late antiquity.

170

118

The Spartan general Brasidas, who fell when defending Amphipolis against the Athenians, was buried in the city and considered as its new founder.

171

The Amphipolitans instituted a cult consisting of various features: *ὥς ἥρωί τε ἐντέμνουσι καὶ τιμὰς δεδώκασιν ἀγῶνας καὶ ἐτησίους θυσίαις*: ("they perform *entemnein* sacrifices to him as a hero and gave him honours in the form of games and annual *thysiai*"). This sacrifice contained a blood ritual covered by the term *entemnein*: the same term was used also for the sacrifices to the war dead *Agathoi* on Thasos, recorded in an inscription discussed above (LSS 64). The meaning of this term was to cut the throats of the animals, a purely technical action, which seems to have had no bearing on the subsequent treatment of the body, i.e., it cannot be automatically assumed that the meat was destroyed in connection with this sacrifice.

172

In a substantial fragment of the *Erechtheus* by Euripides, three sacrifices which can be interpreted as blood rituals are mentioned.

173

The setting in which these rituals are outlined is the end of the play: both Erechtheus and his daughters are dead and Athena instructs his wife Praxithea on the sacrifices they are to receive. The dead daughters, now called the Hyakinthids, are to be given two sets of sacrifices.

120

First of all, they are to have a regular cult consisting of *thysiai* and the slaughter of oxen (σφραγαῖσι [βουκ]τόνοις).

174

The term *sphage*, which is used for wounds, killings, massacres and suicides, refers, in connection with sacrifices, to the actual gesture of killing the animal victim by cutting its throat.

175

This is an action highlighting the blood. *Sphage* differs from *sphagia* (used for battle-line sacrifices, for example), since the latter could mean a separate ritual, a sacrifice of blood which was never followed by a meal.

176

In the *Erechtheus*, the *sphage* rather forms part of the *thysia* and it is possible that the sacrifice referred to was an ordinary *thysia*. On the other hand, since both terms are explicitly mentioned, they can be taken to refer to two kinds of sacrificial actions, which, however, were performed jointly involving the same victims. Even though *sphage* could form part of any regular animal sacrifice, the interpretation of the *sphagai*, in this context, as referring to the actual killing and bleeding of the animals may be supported by them being specified as *bouktonoi*, a unique term but best understood as “ox-slaying”.

177

This is no ordinary slaughter of oxen but an event when the actual killing and bleeding was emphasized.

121

The second set of sacrifices was to be performed to the Hyakinthids in case of war, when the Athenians were to θύειν πρότομα πολεμίου δορός, not using any vine-wood nor libating any wine on the altar

(pyra), but instead pouring out honey and water.

178

The term *protoma* is a *hapax* and has generally been taken to mean a sacrifice before battle.

179

Cropp suggests the translation “pre-cuttings” of sacrificial victims and seems to equate this sacrifice with the battle-line *sphagia* performed just before the armies clashed.

180

However, in war *sphagia* in the true sense, no libations were poured, no fire was lit and no altar was used.

181

Since honey and water were to be poured out at the *protoma* and an altar (*pyra*) is mentioned, this sacrifice seems rather to have been performed before the army took the field than on the actual battleground.

182

122

It is tempting to connect *protoma* with *temnein*, “to cut”, and especially with *protemnein*, meaning “to cut off beforehand”, even though the latter term does not seem to have been used in a religious sense.

183

Protemneinprotoma may be compared to *entemnein-entoma*, the latter being the noun corresponding to *entemnein* and meaning either the victims, whose throats one cuts to make the blood flow into something, or the equivalent rituals.

184

If there is a connection, *protoma* may perhaps have been a sacrifice of blood performed before another action, for example, going to war. The performance of the *protoma* as a preparation for war strengthens the interpretation of the ritual as being centred on blood.

123

Perhaps there is also a connection with *προτομή*, the front part which is cut off, especially the head of an animal.

185

In that case, *protoma* may refer to a ritual in which the whole head of the victim was cut off, in order to bleed the animal dry, and not just the throat. The evidence for the decapitation of animal victims is meagre and the most explicit references are late, but there may have

been a connection between this kind of ritual and war.

186

Of interest is also Odysseus' slaughter and bleeding of sheep over a *bothros* preceding his consultation of Teiresias in the *Odyssey*, covered by the verb ἀποδειροτομεῖν, which may have referred to the victims' heads being severed.

187

Incidentally, a depiction of this scene on a Lucanian, red-figure kalyx-krater shows the severed head of a ram, blood flowing from the neck, lying between Odysseus' feet (Fig. 6).

188

Next to the decapitated head is seen the body of a second animal victim, a ewe with its throat slit, and the head of Teiresias emerging from a pit in the ground.

124

Thus, it is suggested that *protoma* is to be interpreted as a blood ritual performed as a preparation for war, presumably initiating the sacrifice by killing the animals, perhaps by completely cutting off their heads, and emphasizing the blood.



Fig. 6. Odysseus consults the shade of Teiresias by means of the blood from two slaughtered sheep. The head of the ram has been severed from its body and lies between Odysseus' feet. Lucanian kalyx-krater, c. 400–375 BC, Paris, Cabinet des Médailles. From Furtwängler & Reichhold 1900, pl. 60:1.

125

The *sphagai* and the *protoma* concerned the Hyakinthids but Athena also gives Praxithea instructions on how to perform the sacrifices to Erechtheus himself.

189

In his newly constructed precinct, he is to receive *φοναὶ βούθυτοι*. *Bouthysia* originally meant a substantial, solemn sacrifice followed by dining, often in a context of games and festivals, but was later used almost as an equivalent to a hecatomb, often in an ironical sense.

190

Here, however, the meaning must be the older one. *Phone* is usually used for carnage and bloodshed by slaying, often on the battlefield.

191

Phonai bouthytoi may perhaps also be taken to mean a major sacrifice of cattle, at which there was special emphasis on the killing of the animals and presumably also on their blood, either when the animals were slain or afterwards.

192

126

All the blood rituals considered above formed part of a larger sacrificial complex, the other rituals being indicated by a terminology which is different from that covering the blood rituals. Since the killing of the animal had, of course, to precede the handling of the meat, whether it was to be eaten or not, the blood rituals are likely to have initiated these sacrifices. The *haimakouria* was an offering of blood and the *entemnein* sacrifice, the *sphagai bouktonoi*, the *protoma* and the *phonai bouthytoi* probably also denoted the same kind of ritual or a particular way of killing the animal, perhaps by cutting off the head. The contexts in which the blood rituals are found also concern the tomb or the burial of the hero: the *tymbos* of Pelops, the burial and the *mnemeion* of Brasidas at Amphipolis, the burial of the *Agathoi*, the *taphos chthonos* of the Hyakinthids.

193

Erechtheus has also been confined to earth.

194

As for the actual execution of the ritual, the blood may have been poured onto the tomb of the hero, perhaps into a pit dug for that particular purpose.

195

In the case of Erechtheus, the blood may have been discarded over the fissures in the rock of the Acropolis, usually identified as the

location where Erechtheus was killed, and after the construction of the Erechtheion, through the hollow altar placed in the northern portico of this building.

196

127

An additional case of blood rituals performed to heroes is found in Xenophon, who describes a series of sacrifices performed by Kyros at Babylon: a holocaust of bulls to Zeus and a holocaust of horses to the Sun, followed by a blood ritual to the Earth and the local heroes of Syria (ἔπειτα Γῇ σφάζαντες ὡς ἐξηγήσαντο οἱ μάγοι ἐποίησαν ἔπειτα δὲ ἥρωσι τοῖς Συρίαν ἔχουσι).

197

Even though these sacrifices are mentioned in a Greek source, it is questionable whether they are relevant to the rituals in Greek hero-cults, since both the recipients and the context are non-Greek.

198

2.3. Theoxenia

128

The literary evidence for *theoxenia* in hero-cults is not very distinct, when compared with the explicit references to *trapezai* in the epigraphical sources. The performance of *theoxenia* is indicated both by the terminology used and by the character of the offerings.

129

In the fifth *Pythian Ode*, Pindar speaks of how Battos and the people accompanying him to found the colony at Kyrene worshipped the Antenoridai, who were considered to be the mythological founders of the city. Pindar writes that the Antenoridai were warmly welcomed with sacrifices, ἐνδυκέως δέκονται θυσίαισιν, and that Battos and his men greeted them with gifts, οἰχνέοντές σφε δωροφόροι.

199

Of particular interest here is the verb *dekomai* or *dechomai* meaning “to welcome” or “to receive”. Most commentators on the passage agree on the meaning here being interpreted as a *theoxenia* ritual, to which the Antenoridai were invited, but opinions differ on whether Pindar refers to a recurrent cult or to a single occurrence in connection with the arrival of Battos and his people.

200

The context of the cult of the Antenoridai has also been discussed and it seems most plausible to connect the performance of the rituals with the Karneia and the sacrifices to Apollon Karneios. The Antenoridai were welcomed with *thysiai* or invited to the *thysiai*, presumably referring to animal sacrifices which took place at the Karneia.

201

It is thus possible that the *theoxenia* to the Antenoridai should be considered as being performed in connection with animal sacrifice, like many of the *theoxenia* mentioned in the inscriptions, and that this ritual formed one part of a more extensive complex of rituals.

202

130

To receive a hero could be an indication of *theoxenia*, but also the description of the recipient as reclining at a banquet evokes the same kind of ritual. The latter case could be argued for the cult of Pelops at Olympia, also described by Pindar and discussed above in connection with the blood rituals. Pindar states that Pelops νῦν δ' ἐν αἵμακουρίαις ἀγλααῖσι μέμικται, Ἀλφειοῦ πόρῳ κλιθεῖς, (“and now he partakes of splendid blood sacrifices as he reclines by the course of the Alpheos”).

203

It has been suggested that *klitheis* means “reclines”, in the sense that Pelops is not just put to rest in his tomb near the Alpheos but that he is reclining as a guest at a banquet.

204

Gerber, in his commentary on the ode, stresses the analogy between Pelops and Hieron found throughout the poem: Pelops is reclining as at a symposium, while Hieron’s table is often surrounded by guests (line 17).

205

A further reference to banquets is found in *memiktai*: Pelops participates in or partakes of the offerings of blood.

206

It is thus possible to view Pelops as being honoured with *theoxenia*, at which he was presented with the *haimakouria*. As the invited guest of honour, he reclines, but he is drinking blood instead of wine. The *haimakouria* forms a part of the *theoxenia* and, since blood was offered, animal sacrifice must have taken place as well.

207

The nature of the offerings made to heroes could also be taken as an indication of *theoxenia*. The hero Kylabras at Phaselis in Pamphylia received a sacrifice of smoked or salted fish τάριχος.

208

This ritual was said to have originated in the circumstances at the foundation of Phaselis. The oikist Lakios bought the territory from the shepherd Kylabras for some pickled or smoked fish, which was the reason why the Phaselites sacrificed this kind of fish to Kylabras, annually (τάριχον θύουσι).

The sacrifice of fish of this kind cannot have followed the usual proceedings of a regular *thysia*--killing of the animal, burning of the god's portion and consumption of the rest of the meat by the worshippers--since the fish was already dead and prepared. It seems possible that the fish was offered to Kylabras as a part of a *theoxenia* ritual and subsequently eaten by the worshippers, since the offerings were of the same kind as the food eaten by humans.

209

There is no indication of any other kind of sacrifice in this case.

Finally, in the offering of *aparchai* there might have been a *theoxenia* aspect or, more precisely, the handling of the actual offerings recalls the use of *trapezai* known from the inscriptions. Thucydides writes that the war dead at Plataiai were given offerings of clothes and customary gifts, as well as *aparchai* of the fruits of the season from the earth.

210

Aparchai as a main ritual usually consisted of vegetable materials, though cases of animal sacrifices are known.

211

The *aparchai* could be deposited in a particular place, such as a *trapeza*, and may have been destroyed, but seem more commonly to have benefited the priests of the temple where the offerings were made. The cult of the war dead at Plataiai, as described by Thucydides, does not seem to have included animal sacrifice and the offerings were of the kind usually found in simpler versions of *theoxenia*: fruits and agricultural produce.

212

2.4. *Thysia* sacrifices followed by dining

2.4.1. Direct evidence for dining

134

Just as in the inscriptions, many literary contexts in which sacrifices to heroes are mentioned offer little information, apart from the fact that the sacrifice took place.

213

Exactly what was done during the ritual or, whether the sacrifice was followed by a meal, is rarely outlined. In many cases, the literary texts are even less explicit than the epigraphical sources, a difference which is understandable, since the inscriptions were made to regulate cults and the handling of the meat, while the literary sources often mention hero-sacrifices in passing. Therefore, it seems suitable to begin with those contexts which provide the most detailed information about dining.

135

One explicit reference to dining in hero-cults concerns the group of heroes at Taras described in *On marvellous things heard* and discussed previously in connection with the *enagizein* sacrifices.

214

Two categories of heroes are mentioned: on the one hand, the Atreidai, Tydeidai, Aiakidai and Laertiadai, who received an *enagizein* sacrifice *katá tinav qρόnov* at certain times (ἐναγίζειν κατὰ τινος χρόνου) and, on the other, the Agamemnonidai, whose sacrifice was performed on another day (χωρίς θυσίαν ἐπιτελεῖν ἐν ἄλλῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἰδίᾳ). At the sacrifice to the Agamemnonidai, the women were not allowed to taste the meat from the victims sacrificed (ταῖς γυναιξὶ μὴ γεύσασθαι τῶν ἐκείνοις θυομένων).

136

Two important facts concerning hero-cults can be deduced from this passage. First of all, the meat from animals sacrificed to heroes was regularly eaten. Since the women were not allowed to eat of the meat from the victims sacrificed to the Agamemnonidai, this must mean that the meat was consumed by the men alone. The exception here is not the fact that the hero-cult included dining but that women were excluded from tasting the meat.

215

Secondly, it is clear from the use of the terminology that heroes could receive two different kinds of sacrifices, labelled *enagizein* and *thyein* respectively. Since it is obvious that *thyein* here means a sacrifice followed by dining, it must be assumed that *enagizein* refers to a sacrifice not including dining.

216

137

References to dining, as explicit as this text, are rare in the literary evidence for hero-cults. However, a *thysia* sacrifice which ended with dining contained particular rituals, such as the burning of the divinity's portion in the altar fire, and the mention of such actions can also be taken as an indication of the meat being available for consumption.

138

The rituals that preceded the dining are described by Pindar in the fourth *Isthmian Ode* in a passage dealing with the worship of Herakles and the sons of Herakles and Megara at Thebes, outside the Electran gate.

217

τῶ μὲν Ἀλειτρᾶν ὑπερθεὺς δαῖτα πορσύνοντες ἄστοι
καὶ νεόδματα στεφανώματα βωμῶν αὔξομεν
ἔμπυρα χαλκοαρᾶν ὀνῶς θανόντων,
τοὺς Μεγάρᾳ τέκε οἱ Κρεοντὶς υἱοὺς
65 τοῖσιν ἐν θυμαῖσιν αὐγᾶν φλόξ ἀνατελλομένα συνεχῆς
παννυχίζει,
αἰθέρα κνισάεντι λακτίζοισα καπνῶ,
καὶ δεῦτερον ἄμαρ ἐτείων τέρμ' ἀέθλων
γίνεται, ἰσχύος ἔργον.

In his honour, above the Electran Gates we citizens prepare a feast and a newly built circle of altars and multiply burnt offerings for the eight bronze-clad men who died, the sons that Megara, Kreon's daughter, bore to him. For them at sunset the flame rises and burns all night long, kicking heaven with its savour of smoke. And on the second day is the conclusion of the annual games, the labour of strength.

218

139

Both Herakles and his eight sons with Megara receive sacrifices by the Thebans. For Herakles, a banquet (*dais*) is prepared. In Pindar, *dais* means a festive meal for the gods among themselves, but most frequently a meal in honour of the gods, i.e., a sacrificial banquet at which the meat was distributed and eaten.

219

Next are mentioned a number of *bomoi*, which either had been newly constructed in a circle or freshly garlanded, depending on how the text is interpreted.

220

These *bomoi* must have been used for the sacrifices to Herakles himself, but also for the sacrifices to his eight sons, sacrifices which consisted of burnt offerings, *empyra*.

221

The sacrifices to the sons of Herakles and Megara seem to have been regular *thysiai*, at which the portions of the heroes were burnt on the *bomoi*, filling the air with *knise* (αἰθέρα κνισάεντι λακτίζουσα καπνῶ). The burning of the sacrificial fires all through the night is unusual at a regular sacrifice, since the fire would normally have been extinguished by a wine-water libation after the divinity's portion had been burnt.

222

Even though the time when the sacrifice is performed (at sunset) and the extensive use of the fire differ from the practices at a standard *thysia*, there is no indication of a larger part of the victim being burnt than was the usual practice. The whole ceremony ended the following day with the celebration of games.

223

140

The combination of *dais* and *bomos* to describe the cult of a hero is found also in the ninth *Olympian Ode* by Pindar.

224

Here, the victorious wrestler Epharmostos is said to crown the *bomos* of Aias at the festive meal (*dais*) of the hero, presumably referring to an animal sacrifice followed by the victory banquet.

225

2.4.2. Circumstantial evidence for dining

141

In the three passages discussed above, it is clear that the sacrifices ended with dining, since it is stated that the meat was eaten or the rituals described were of the kind characteristic of a sacrifice ending with a banquet. The remaining passages are not as explicit. However, it can be argued also here that the contexts in which the sacrifices are found support an interpretation of the ritual as a *thysia* with a

banquet. In some cases, the sacrifices are performed in a ritual setting for which an interpretation of the sacrifices as a *thysia* with dining is the most plausible. In other cases, the performance of a sacrifice followed by dining is evident from the execution of other rituals on the same occasion, for example, blood rituals and *theoxenia*. Finally, heroes are mentioned together with gods or other divine beings as recipients of sacrifices without any direct indications of there being any ritual distinctions.

142

The ritual setting of the sacrifice can serve as a guideline for the interpretation of the kind of ritual performed. For example, a sacrifice to a hero, which was performed at a major state festival, is likely to have included dining. That was the case of the hero-cult to Adrastos and his successor Melanippos at Sikyon.

226

Owing to the political development (a conflict with Argos), Kleisthenes of Sikyon decided to exchange the hero Adrastos, an Argive, for the hero Melanippos from Thebes. The sacrifices and festivals (θυσίας τε καὶ ὀρτάς) were taken away from Adrastos and promptly given to Melanippos, while the tragic choruses of Adrastos were transferred back to Dionysos. Adrastos was ousted from his *heroon* in the market-place and Melanippos was given a *temenos* in the *prytaneion*.

143

The cult of these two heroes must have been of central importance for Sikyon, since the fate of the city was considered as depending on the geographical origin of the hero worshipped in its centre. Both Adrastos and Melanippos received *thysiai* and *heortai*, sacrifices and festivals. The use of these two terms together also indicates that this cult was a major event.

227

Even though *heortai* could occasionally include some gloomy or lugubrious elements, the majority of such festivals were pleasant and joyful experiences with an abundance of food and entertainment.

228

Moreover, the location of the *temenos* of Melanippos in the *prytaneion* indicates a further connection with dining, since this was one of the main functions of such a building.

229

Adrastos and Melanippos were given *thysiai* and *heortai*, rituals that are likely to have included dining. A similar case is that of the heroes at Delphi, described by Pindar in the seventh *Nemean Ode*.

230

Here, Pindar speaks about the fate of Neoptolemos, who was killed at Delphi and buried in the sanctuary of Apollon. His purpose after death was to stay at Delphi and see to the processions honouring heroes with many sacrifices (ἡρώϊαις δέ πομπαῖς θεμισιόπον οἰκεῖν ἔόντα πολυθύτοις, lines 46–47). Who those heroes were is not stated, but their cult must have been substantial, since the rituals are described as *polythytoi*, “with many sacrifices”.

231

These sacrifices are likely to have been of the regular *thysia* kind followed by dining, since the heroes also received *pompai*, a feature particularly connected with that type of sacrificial ritual.

232

145

The hero-sacrifices at Sikyon and Delphi are not very explicit in ritual detail, but their execution at a festival (*heorte*) or in connection with a procession (*pompe*), respectively, makes it likely that dining took place. In other cases, the ritual detail is more abundant and the occurrence of a *thysia* with dining can be argued from the fact that other rituals with a different content were performed on the same occasion. The *thysia* with dining was complemented with another kind of sacrifice, expressed by a particular term or terms. These complementary rituals mainly concern the blood of the sacrificial animal and in one case there is also a *theoxenia* element. The evidence for blood rituals and *theoxenia* in these passages has already been outlined but can now be put into a wider context and be related to the *thysia* sacrifices.

233

146

The most interesting case of a hero-sacrifice, consisting of both a *thysia* and another ritual, is the cult of the Spartan general Brasidas at Amphipolis, described by Thucydides.

234

The text runs as follows:

Μετά δὲ ταῦτα τὸν Βρασίδαν οἱ ξύμμαχοι πάντες ξὺν ὅλοις ἐπισπόμενοι

δημοσίᾳ ἔθαψαν ἐν τῇ πόλει πρὸ τῆς νῦν ἀγορᾶς οὐσης καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν οἱ

Ἄμφιπολῖται περιεΐρξαντες αὐτοῦ τό μνημεῖον, ὥς ἥρωί τε ἐντέμνουσι καὶ

τιμὰς δεδῶκασιν ἀγῶνας καὶ ἐτησίους θυσίας, καὶ τὴν ἀποικίαν ὥς οἰκιστῇ

προσέθεσαν, καταβαλόντες τὰ Ἀγνώνεια οἰκοδομήματα καὶ ἀφανίσαντες εἰ

τι μνημόσυνόν που ἔμελλεν αὐτοῦ τῆς οἰκίσεως περιέσεσθαι, νομίσαντες τὸν

μὲν Βρασίδαν σωτῆρά τε σφῶν γεγενῆσθαι καὶ ἐν τῷ παρόντι ἅμα τὴν τῶν

Λακεδαιμονίων ζυμμαχίαν φόβῳ τῶν Ἀθηναίων θεραπεύοντες, τὸν δὲ Ἀγνωνα

κατὰ τό πολέμιον τῶν Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἂν ὁμοίως σφίσι ξυμφόρως οὐδ' ἂν ἡδέως τὰς τιμὰς ἔχειν.

Brasidas was buried in the city with public honours in front of what is now the Agora. The whole body of the allies in full armour escorted him to the grave. The Amphipolitans fenced off his tomb, and to this day they cut the throats of victims to him as a hero, and have also instituted games and yearly sacrifices in his honour. They also made him their founder, and dedicated the colony to him, pulling down the cult buildings of Hagnon, and obliterating any other solid memorials of Hagnon's foundation. For they thought Brasidas was their saviour, and in the present circumstances fear of Athens made them flatter their Spartan allies. The idea that Hagnon should retain the honours of a founder, now that they were enemies of the Athenians, seemed to them against their interests, and uncongenial.

235

147

Brasidas, who had captured the city from the Athenians in 424 BC, was, after his death in battle, buried by the Amphipolitans and given a monument in the agora. Thucydides says that the Amphipolitans fenced in his monument and ever since ὥς ἥρωί τε ἐντέμνουσι καὶ τιμὰς δεδῶκασιν ἀγῶνας καὶ ἐτησίους θυσίας. They also adopted him as a founder of the colony and obliterated the cult buildings of Hagnon, the previous founder.

236

148

This passage is frequently evoked in discussions on sacrificial rituals in hero-cults, since it is so detailed and has consequently been interpreted variously. It is clear that Brasidas received various kinds of sacrifices and honours: *entemnein* sacrifices “as a hero”, games and annual *thysiai*.

237

Malkin argued that Brasidas received two kinds of cults, which should not be viewed as being antithetic but rather as juxtaposed.

238

Ἐντέμνουσι refers to a continuous cult of a more popular kind, while δεδῶκασιν ἀγῶνας καὶ ἐτησίους θυσίας meant the institution of a solemn, annual, state cult with sacrifices and games.

239

This interpretation, however, does not account for the technical meaning of the term *entemnein* as “cutting the throat of the animal”. Why should the popular ongoing worship of Brasidas consist in a sacrifice which emphasized the slaughtering and bleeding of the animal, even when such sacrifices were also followed by dining?

149

It is better to view the whole ritual as one sacrificial complex, consisting of different parts. *Entemnein* must refer to a blood ritual: the cutting of the throats of the victims and disposing of the blood, presumably on the tomb of Brasidas.

240

This blood ritual formed an initial part of the cult, which was followed by the *thysiai*, i.e., the burning of the hero's share of the victims and the dining on the meat by the worshippers.

150

Brasidas was buried in the centre of the city and his cult was a state festival, an event likely to have centred on ritual dining. One further reason to argue that the *thysiai* ended with a banquet may be found in the fact that the principal title given to Brasidas was *oikistes*.

241

The cult of an *oikist* was of central importance for the identity of a city and is likely to have involved ritual meals on a grand scale, with the purpose of integrating all members of the society.

242

Thus, the *thysiai* must refer to these meals which took place in connection with the annual sacrifices.

151

The cult of Brasidas is also mentioned by Aristotle, who speaks of the cult as τὸ θύειν Βρασίδα, without specifying any particular details.

243

In this case, *theyein* is best understood as a general term meaning “to sacrifice”, which probably included the rituals outlined by Thucydides (a blood ritual and *thysiai* with dining), but it is also

possible that the *entemnein* sacrifice was no longer performed in the 4th century and at that time the ritual consisted only in sacrifices followed by ritual dining.

152

The terminology used for the cult of Brasidas can be interpreted as referring to two kinds of sacrificial rituals: a regular *thysia* with dining, which was complemented by or extended with the handling of the blood of the animal victims in a particular manner. A similar ritual seems to have been performed to the daughters of Erechtheus, the Hyakinthids, as documented in the *Erechtheus* by Euripides.

244

After the death of the daughters of Erechtheus in attempting to save Athens, Athena instructs their mother Praxithea on the burial of her daughters, now to be called the Hyakinthids, and on how the ritual to them is to be performed and their sanctuary administered.

... τοῖς ἑμοῖς ἀστο[ῖς λέγ]ω
 ἐνιαυσίαις σφας μὴ λελησμένους] χρόνῳ
 θυσίαισι τιμᾶν καὶ σφαγαῖσι [βουκ]τόνοις
 80 νοσμοῦ[ντας ἱεροῖς παρθένων [χορεύ]μασιν
 γνον[.....]χθρ. εἰς μάχην
 κιν[.....]ας ἀσπίδα στρατ[
 πρώταισι θύειν πρότομα πολέμιου δορὸς
 τῆς οἰνοποιοῦ μὴ θιγόντας ἀμπέλου
 85 μηδ' εἰς πυρὰν σπένδοντας ἀλλὰ πολυπόνου
 καρπὸν μελίσσης ποταμίαις πηγαῖς ὁμοῦ
 ἄβατον δέ τέμενος παισὶ ταῖσδ' εἶναι χρεῶν,
 εἰργεῖν τε μὴ τις πολέμιων θύσῃ λαθῶν
 νίκην μὲν αὐτοῖς γῇ δὲ τῇδε πημονήν.

I instruct my citizens to honour them, never forgetting over time, with annual sacrifices and slaughtering of oxen, adorning the festival with sacred maiden-dances; _....._ into/for battle, rous- _..._ shield _..._, to offer first to them (the Hyakinthids) the sacrifice preliminary to battle, not touching the wine-producing vine nor pouring wine upon the altar but rather the industrious bee's produce together with stream-water. There shall be an untrodden sanctuary dedicated to these maidens; you must prevent any of your enemies from secretly making offerings there so as to bring victory to themselves and affliction to this land.

245

153

The Hyakinthids were to be honoured with annual sacrifices and slaughtering of oxen (θυσίαισι τιμᾶν καὶ σφαγαῖσι [βουκ]τόνοις), as well as with sacred dances of maidens (lines 77–80). The following

two lines are damaged, but they seem to introduce the theme of war and to indicate that the Hyakinthids could help in that kind of situation.

246

If there was a war, the Athenians were first to offer to the Hyakinthids a sacrifice preliminary to battle (or “before taking up the spear of war”, θύειν πρότομα πολεμίου δορός, line 83), not using wood from the vines, nor pouring wine on the sacrificial fire or altar, but instead using honey and water from rivers τῆς οἰνοποιοῦ μὴ θιγόντας ἀμπέλου μηδ' εἰς πυρὰν σπένδοντας ἀλλὰ πολυπόνου καρπὸν μελίσσης ποταμίαις πηγαῖς ὁμοῦ, lines 84–86). Furthermore, the sanctuary of the Hyakinthids was to be an *abaton*, and any enemies must be prevented from secretly sacrificing (*thyein*) there, in order to bring victory to themselves and misery to the Athenians.

247

154

The rituals used in the worship of the Hyakinthids thus seem to have consisted of two sets of sacrifices, one kind performed continuously and another, which was used in the case of war.

248

155

The first set of sacrifices consisted of *thysiai* and *sphagai* (lines 77–80). Since the two terms *thysiai* and *sphagai* are here found together, they can be taken to refer to two kinds of sacrificial actions, which, however, were performed jointly. *Thysia* covers the main ritual, consisting of an animal sacrifice ending with dining, an interpretation which is strengthened by the fact that, on the same occasion, the sacred dances of the maidens took place.

249

Sphagai bouktonoi, “ox-sacrificing slaughters”, indicates a highlighting of the blood of the victims (see above, pp. 172–173). The *sphagai* could be considered as forming a ritual separate from the *thysiai*, but it seems more plausible that they constituted a part of the *thysiai* and were performed with the same victims. The detailed terminology of the passage may be seen as a desire to show that, in this case, the ritual differed from an ordinary *thysia*, since the blood was of particular importance.

250

How this blood ritual was performed is not known, but it is possible that the animal was killed in a fashion different from that at a regular *thysia* and that the blood was libated on the tomb of the Hyakinthids.

156

The second set of sacrifices to the Hyakinthids (lines 81–86) seems to have been used when there was an emergency (war). In this ritual, the Athenians were to *thyein a protoma*. The *hapax protoma* has been interpreted as meaning a sacrifice connected in particular with war. It was suggested earlier (pp. 173–175) that this term may refer to a blood ritual performed before the army left Athens. The heads of the victims used in this sacrifice may have been completely cut off and the blood poured on the grave of the Hyakinthids. In any case, the *protoma* sacrifice differed from a regular *thysia* in several respects. Vine wood was not allowed for the sacrificial fire, and the usual libations of wine were to be replaced with honey and water. The offerings are likely to have consisted of animal victims, since both *thyein* and *spendein* are used, as well as the mention of an altar, *pyra*, and, albeit in a negative sense, firewood.

251

It is thus possible to interpret this sacrifice as a *thysia*, modified by a series of libations consisting of blood, honey and water instead of wine, but still followed by dining, since the ritual was performed at Athens and should not be understood as a battle-line *sphagia*. This second set of sacrifices is probably the same as those referred to in a fragment of Philochoros, according to which both wineless *thysiai* and the burning of some wood were performed to Dionysos and the daughters of Erechtheus.

252

157

The context of the *protoma* sacrifice was when war was approaching. This ritual does not seem to have been a sacrifice taking place on the battlefield but was rather accomplished in Athens, in or at the *abaton* of the Hyakinthids, since it was this sanctuary that the Athenians were to watch, so that no enemy should secretly sacrifice there to gain victory in war (lines 87–89). Whether the temporary *protoma* sacrifices and the annual *thysia* took place at the same location cannot be deduced from the text, but this interpretation may be possible.

253

In the same Euripides fragment are also outlined the sacrifices to Erechtheus himself.

254

πόσει δὲ τῷ σῶ σηκὸν ἐμ μέση πόλει
 τεῦξαι κελεύω περιβόλοισι λαῖνοις,
 κεκλήσεται δὲ τοῦ κτανόντος οὔνεκα
 σεμνὸς Ποσειδῶν ὄνομα' ἐπονομασμένος
 ἀστοῖς Ἐρεχθεὺς ἐμ φοναῖσι βουθύτοις

For your husband I command the building in mid-city of a precinct with stone enclosure. In recollection of his killer the citizens, slaughtering sacrificial oxen, shall call him august Poseidon surnamed Erechtheus.

255

159

Athena instructs Praxithea (and the Athenians) to build a precinct with a stone enclosure in the middle of the city (σηκὸν ἐν μέση πόλει τεῦξαι ... περιβόλοισι λαῖνοις). In the cult, Erechtheus is to be called Poseidon, surnamed Erechtheus as a recollection of him being killed by the god.

256

The sacrifices are called *phonai bouthytoi*, “ox-sacrificing slaughters”. The term *phonai*, often used for carnage on the battlefield, links these sacrifices with war and bloodshed, and the ritual may be understood as a substantial sacrifice of cattle at which the blood was of particular importance (see above, pp. 175–176). The rest of the ritual was probably a regular *thysia*, since the term used is *bouthytoi*, and ended with the worshippers dining on the meat.

257

The blood of the victims may have been poured onto the fissures in the Acropolis rock, usually considered as the location where Erechtheus was killed, above which was later placed the hollow altar in the northern portico of the Erechtheion.

258

Thus the sacrifices to Erechtheus follow a ritual scheme corresponding to that of the Hyakinthids.

259

As for the ritual context of these sacrifices to Erechtheus, there are no clear indications. The rituals described may have formed a part of the Panathenaia, a festival which has even been suggested as originally dedicated to Erechtheus, but the offerings to this hero outlined in the *Erechtheus* have also been assigned to the Skira.

160

The cult of Brasidas at Amphipolis and the sacrifices to the Hyakinthids and Erechtheus showed a similar pattern in the sacrificial practices. The major ritual seems to have been a *thysia* with dining. This sacrifice was complemented with another kind of ritual, which focused on the killing, bleeding and handling of the blood of the animal, as is indicated by the use of the term *entemnein* at the sacrifice to Brasidas, *sphagai* and *protoma* at the annual sacrifices to the Hyakinthids and perhaps also *phonai* in the cult of Erechtheus. A last case can be added to this category: the cult of Pelops at Olympia. Here, the blood ritual seems to have been performed in the context of a *thysia*, but there was also a *theoxenia* element.

161

The reference to the sacrifices to Pelops at Olympia is to be found in Pindar's first *Olympian Ode*

261

90 νῦν δ' ἐν αἵμακουρίαις
ἀγλααῖσι μέμικται,
Ἀλφειοῦ πόρῳ κλιθείς,
τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων πολυξενωτάτῳ παρὰ βωμῷ.

And now he partakes of splendid blood sacrifices as he reclines by the course of the Alpheos, having his much-attended tomb beside the altar thronged by visiting strangers

262

162

Even though there is very little written evidence for the actual sacrifices to Pelops, it is clear that he was the most important hero worshipped at Olympia, being almost on an equal footing with Zeus.

263

163

The language Pindar uses to describe the rituals of Pelops is both rich and unusual, but the use of νῦν at the beginning of the description of the sacrifices makes it likely that he reports the sacrificial practices of his own time.

264

In the discussion previously in this chapter, two of the rituals outlined by Pindar have already been touched upon: the sacrifices of blood covered by *haimakouriai* and the presence of a *theoxenia* element indicated, above all, by *klitheis*.

265

To have an offering of blood, there must be an animal victim, or rather victims, since the *haimakouriai* are in the plural and are called *aglaaisi* --splendid or magnificent.

266

It was suggested earlier that the *haimakouriai* formed a part of the *theoxenia* and that Pelops, as an invited guest, received blood instead of wine. The question is, what was done with the rest of the victims after the blood had been used? The meat could have been destroyed, but there is nothing in Pindar's text that supports such an interpretation. It is possible that some of the meat was prepared and offered to Pelops along with the blood at the *theoxenia*, but most or all of the meat was probably consumed at a banquet.

165

Of great interest for the treatment of the meat is the *bomos* mentioned in line 93. Pelops has his τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ... παρὰ πολυξενωτάτῳ βωμῷ ("his much-attended tomb beside the altar thronged by visiting strangers"). This altar has usually been understood as the famous ash-altar of Zeus, which was located somewhere to the east of the Pelopion.

267

Gerber, however, in his commentary on the ode, interprets the altar as that of Pelops and suggests that *polyxenotatos* may be understood as meaning both "visited by many foreigners" and as "entertaining many guests".

268

He further proposes that *amphipolon*, usually translated as "much visited", may be a reference to *amphipoloi*, i.e., the servants bringing food and drink.

269

This would mean that both the tomb and the altar were much visited and also entertained many guests, which, of course, is possible only if the sacrifice to Pelops was a *thysia* with dining for the worshippers. The interpretation of the altar as that of Pelops would constitute a further analogy between Pelops and Hieron: Pelops' altar entertains many guests, just as Hieron's table is often surrounded by guests.

270

166

It is thus possible to interpret Pindar's text as describing three kinds

of rituals: a blood ritual, *theoxenia* and *thysia* with dining. Pelops would have been given the *haimakouriai*, the blood of the animals slaughtered, at the *theoxenia* to which he had been invited. The blood was probably poured on his burial mound, perhaps into a pit which may have been dug for each occasion or was a permanent installation.

271

It is also possible that he received additional portions of meat, perhaps placed on a table. The *haimakouria* and the *theoxenia* were both, however, part of the *thysia* sacrifice, at which the worshippers dined on the meat from the sacrificial victims, which had been sacrificed at his *bomos*.

272

The *thysia* was the major ritual which was modified by the *haimakouriai* and the *theoxenia*.

167

One final comment on the sacrifices to Pelops concerns the preparation of the meat for the banquet. Several scholars have argued that there was a particular connection between the use of cauldrons at Olympia and the cult of Pelops and that the meat from the sacrifices to this hero may have been boiled instead of grilled.

273

There is nothing in Pindar's text which indicates a use of a cauldron at the actual sacrifices, but, according to the myth, Pelops was boiled in a cauldron.

274

Cauldrons were used in other sacrifices at Olympia for boiling the meat, and it is possible that this was also the method of preparing the meat from the victims sacrificed to Pelops.

275

168

The final group of literary sources to be considered under the heading of *Circumstantial evidence for dining* consists of cases in which the sacrifices to heroes are mentioned together with sacrifices to gods or other divine beings. In general, these texts offer little information apart from the term for the sacrifice, usually *thyein* or *thysia*. However, the context may be an indication of the kinds of rituals used. In the epigraphical evidence, sacrifices to heroes and gods were intermingled in the same sacred law or sacrificial calendar,

without any indications of there being any ritual distinctions as to how the sacrifices were to be executed. For these inscriptions, it was suggested that the ritual meant must have been the one most frequently performed in Greek cult, i.e., *thysia* with dining. A similar argument can be made for the texts.

169

When Plato describes the necessary kind of legislation connected with religion, which was stipulated by Apollon at Delphi, he mentions the founding of temples, sacrifices and other forms of worship to the gods, *daimones* and heroes (ἱερῶν τε ἰδρύσεις καὶ θυσίαι καὶ ἄλλαι θεῶν τε καί).

276

Furthermore, the dead were to be buried and given the appropriate services to keep them happy.

277

This division between various recipients of cult or of religious attendance can, to a certain extent, be said to be a philosophical construct, which does not necessarily reflect actual, practised religion. The religious category of *daimones*, in particular, is a feature of the writings of the philosophers.

278

Still, it is of interest to note that the gods, the *daimones* and the heroes are considered as forming one category receiving one kind of treatment, while the dead form a special group.

279

There is no indication that the heroes were treated in a fashion different from that of the gods and the *daimones*

170

In the *Laws*, Plato lists, in a similar fashion, the different kinds of recipients of religious attention in descending order.

280

First of all, *timai* are to be accorded to the gods, both to the Olympian gods and to the gods of the polis, as well as to the chthonian gods. Then the wise man will worship the *daimones*, and after them heroes (τοις δαίμοσιν ὃ γ' ἔμφρων ὀργιάζοιτ' ἄν, ἥρωσι δὲ μετὰ τούτους). After these come private shrines dedicated to the ancestral gods and, finally, the *timai* paid to the living parents.

The grading of gods, heroes and ordinary mortals is found also in the philosophical treaty entitled *On the cosmos* (transmitted with the Aristotelian corpus).

281

In this text, discussing the divine law and order which is to govern the city, it is stated that the law orders customary public feasts and yearly festivals, *thysiai* to the gods, *therapeiai* to the heroes and *choai* to the dead.

282

The distinction, if any, between the *thysiai* and the *therapeiai* cannot be defined from this context, but both these categories are likely to have been substantial sacrifices, unlike the simple *choai* to the dead.

The lumping together of heroes and gods in speaking of sacrifices is found in the speeches and historical texts as well. Demosthenes mentions a case of the Athenians praying and sacrificing (θύσαντας) to the gods and heroes who guard their city and country.

283

In a fragment of Philochoros, it is stated that, if someone sacrifices (θύῃ) a cow to Athena, a sheep must also be sacrificed (θύειν) to Pandrosos and the victim was called *epiboion*.

284

Xenophon describes how Kyros performed *thysiai* to the gods and heroes of Assyria to win their favour, after having crossed the border into that country.

285

These sacrifices were likely to have been jointly made to both the gods and the heroes, since Xenophon specifies that they were preceded by another kind of ritual to a different recipient: propitiatory libations to Earth (Γῆν ἱλάσμετο χοαῖς). Before crossing the border between Media and Assyria, Kyros had already sacrificed first to Zeus Basileus and then to the rest of the gods, while the heroes dwelling in Media and guarding the country were invited to come and join in (*symparakalein*).

If the heroes also received any sacrifices of their own, they must have been the same as those to the gods.

173

A lengthy oracle, preserved in the speech *Against Makartatos*, mentions sacrifices to both gods and heroes.

In order to obtain good omens, the Athenians were instructed by Delphi to perform a series of sacrifices. First of all, they were to sacrifice (θύοντας) to Zeus Hypatos, Athena Hypate, Herakles and Apollon Soter and send offerings (ἀπόπμπειν) to the Amphiones. The next part of the oracle prescribes a sacrifice to Apollon, Leto and Artemis: the streets are to be drenched in sacrificial smoke, kraters and dances are to be set up (τὰς ἀγυιάς κνισῆν, καὶ κρατῆρας ἱστάμεν καὶ χορούς) and the participants are to wear wreaths after the custom of their fathers. To all the Olympian gods and goddesses, thank-offerings are to be made (μνασιδωρεῖν) with raised arms, according to ancestral custom. Thirdly, to the Heros Archegetes, the Athenians were to sacrifice and bring presents (θύειν καὶ δωροτελεῖν), after the custom of their fathers. Finally, the relatives should fulfil their duties to the dead on an appointed day, according to established custom (τοῖς ἀποφθιμένοις ... τελεῖν ... κατὰ ἀγῆμενα).

174

The first group of sacrifices performed to Zeus, Athena, Herakles and Apollon must have been regular *thysiai*. It should be noted that Herakles is treated as one of the gods, while the Amphiones are not. The offerings sent to this pair of Theban brothers may not even have included animal sacrifice.

The sacrifices to Apollon, Leto and Artemis were definitely regular *thysiai* with dining, since the streets were drenched in *knise*, and they took place in a festive mood, in which wreaths were worn and dances performed. The Olympian gods and goddesses mentioned next are probably the gods in general and the gifts brought to them may have meant animal sacrifice, but it is possible that the gifts were some kind of *aparchai*. The sacrifice to the Heros Archegetes makes up a separate entry, which may imply that he received a kind of sacrifice different

from that of the gods and heroes mentioned so far, but it is also possible that the division simply meant that his sacrifice should be performed on a separate occasion or simply at a different location. The rituals to the dead, finally, were definitely supposed to take place on a particular day.

175

In this last category of passages, there are no indications of any clear distinctions between the sacrifices to the heroes and those to the gods. The use of the same or equivalent terms for the rituals to both heroes and gods makes any major distinctions in the sacrificial practices unlikely. If anything, the texts indicate a separation between, on the one hand, divine recipients, such as gods and heroes (and *daimones* in the philosophical writings) and, on the other hand, ordinary mortals, either dead or still alive. On the basis of the general terminology and the lack of details, it is probable that, in the case of gods and heroes, it was the most common ritual that was intended, i.e., an animal sacrifice followed by a meal. However, the sense of these texts should not be forced too far, since they are rarely, if ever, intended to describe ritual practices in detail and the sacrifices are often mentioned in passing in a context dealing with non-religious matters. Furthermore, the division between various kinds of divinities in the philosophical treatises, such as in Plato, may be more of a theoretical construct than a reflection of actual, practised cult.

290

2.4.3. Unspecified cases

176

Finally, there is a handful of cases of sacrifices to heroes which are even less explicit than the texts discussed so far. The question here is how the lack of details is to be interpreted, just as in the passages in which heroes and gods were mentioned together without any indication of ritual distinctions.

177

On the one hand, the scarcity of ritual specifications can be interpreted as due to the source speaking only of “a sacrifice” in general, without any intention of elaborating on ritual detail. In that case, these passages can be used only as evidence of hero-cult sacrifices taking place, but not of the kind of actions which they

contained. On the other hand, the lack of information may also be considered as referring to sacrifices of the most frequent kind, and that was why it was considered unnecessary to specify any details. However, if we assume that the lack of information should be interpreted as the sacrifice being of the kind that was most common in hero-cults, we still have to define which kind of sacrificial rituals was intended. Judging from the evidence reviewed so far, both epigraphical and literary, it seems as if the most common ritual in hero-cults was a *thysia* followed by dining.

178

Aisopos, in a fable called *The hero*, tells the story of a man who had a hero near his house and was sacrificing lavishly to him (πολυτελῶς ἔθυσεν; πολλὰ εἰς θυσίας δαπανῶντος).

291

One night, the hero appeared before the man and told him to stop destroying his property by this extravagant activity. If the man ruined all his fortune, the hero was afraid that he would have to take the blame.

179

The *thysiai* performed to this hero may have been of any kind. From what we know of the sacrificial practices of private individuals and families, animal sacrifice seems to have been quite rare, as compared with offerings of fruit, vegetables and cakes.

292

On the other hand, the hero's point of view is just that the sacrifices may threaten to ruin the man, and therefore they are better understood as more expensive animal sacrifices. There seems to be no reason to interpret them as anything else than regular *thysia*.

180

In other passages, the information is very brief. Pindar writes in the fifth *Isthmian Ode* that Tydeus and Meleager, the sons of Oineus, received θυσίαι φαειναί, "brilliant sacrifices", from the Aetolians.

293

The description of the sacrifices as brilliant may be an indication of the use of fire, since the adjective φαεινός could be used to describe a shining or radiant fire, but the term could also be used metaphorically.

294

A fragment of Philochoros speaks of the sacrifices to a hero called

Keramos: . τοῦ θύειν κέραμω τινὶ ἥρω.

295

Lykourgos is mentioned in an Ephoros passage as being the only one of the Spartan law-makers to have had a temple constructed to him and receiving annual sacrifices (ιερόν ιδρυθῆναι κατ ἔτος).

296

181

Two texts mention the rituals performed to the war dead at Athens. According to Plato, the war dead were to be given prayers and *thysiai*.

297

In a later passage from the same text, the honours accorded to the war dead are specified as an annual public performance of the private funerary rituals (*ta nomizomena*), as well as athletic contests, horse-races and music.

298

Demosthenes speaks of the war dead as receiving deathless honours, a memorial erected by the State, *thysiai* and games.

299

The content and extent of the religious treatment of the war dead are difficult to grasp, since the sources offer few details.

300

It is clear, however, that they received public funerals and a consecutive cult, as well as athletic games, horse-races and music competitions. The war dead occupied a prominent place in society, especially in democratic Athens, and it therefore seems likely that the sacrifices consisted of animal victims. Furthermore, since the burial and commemoration of the war dead was a public ritual, distinct from the private celebrations of the dead, some kind of collective ritual dining may be assumed.

182

The final four passages to be considered are from Herodotos, and all of them use the terms *thyein* or *thysia* for the sacrifices. Herodotos is a rich source of information about hero-cults, mentioning such sacrifices no less than 13 times. His use of different terms for the rituals must reflect a wish to differentiate between various kinds of sacrifices, for example, *enagizein* for destruction sacrifices, *thyein/thysia* for sacrifices followed by meals, and *choai* for rituals consisting only of libations.

301

183

The first passage concerns the athlete Philippos of Kroton, winner at Olympia and the most beautiful of all Greeks.

302

According to Herodotos, Philippos participated in the Spartan attempt to colonize Sicily but was killed in battle with the combined forces of the Phoenicians and Segestans. He was buried at Segesta and received unrivalled honours from the Segestans because of his beauty. They built a *heroon* on his tomb and propitiated him with sacrifices (θυσίησι αὐτὸν ἱλάσθονται). Of particular interest here is the fact that the sacrifices were aimed at propitiating Philippos. It is not clear from Herodotos' account why this had to be done. Two alternatives are possible: either Philippos had to be appeased, since he had caused some kind of problem for the Segestans, perhaps since he was a former enemy of theirs (cf. the Phokaians killed at Agylla), or, if he was propitiated, he was thought to be able to help the worshippers in some way.

303

The use of the verb *hilaskesthai* may indicate that these sacrifices contained particular rituals, but it is also possible that the use of this term simply refers to the aim of the whole sacrifice and has no bearing on the ritual content.

304

184

In the last three Herodotos passages, the *thyein* sacrifices are said to be performed ὡς ἥρω or ὡς νόμος οἰκιστῆ. Whether these additions refer to the recipient being regarded as a hero or an oikist or to the *thyein* sacrifices having a particular content will be more fully discussed below, since ὡς ἥρω is also used together with *enagizein*, *entemnein* and *timan*.

185

The first passage concerns Onesilos, king of Salamis on Cyprus, who was killed in the siege of Amathous.

305

The Amathousians cut off his head and placed it above the gates to their city, where it hung until the hollow skull was entered by a swarm of bees, which filled it with their honey comb.

306

The Amathousians consulted an oracle concerning the matter and were told to take the head down, bury it and θύειν ὡς ἥρω annually

to Onesilos, since, if they did so, they would fare better.

186

The second case of θύειν ὡς ἥρω concerns the overseer of Xerxes, Artachaies, who was the tallest man in Persia and had the loudest voice on earth.

307

He died at Akanthos during the Persian invasion and was mourned by Xerxes, who gave him a funeral and a substantial burial mound.

308

The Akanthians continue to sacrifice to him in accordance with an oracle (θύουσι Ἀκάνθιοι ἐκ θεοπροπίου ὡς ἥρω) and to call his name.

187

In both these cases, apart from the specification of *thyein* as ὡς ἥρω, there is nothing in the contexts which indicates that any particular kinds of rituals were performed. The construction θύειν ὡς ἡ ρω may be compared with θύειν ὡς νόμος οἰκιστῇ, which Herodotos uses in describing the honours accorded to the deceased Miltiades by the Chersonesitai, whom he had ruled as a “tyrant”.

309

Ever since Miltiades died, the Chersonesitai sacrificed to him “as it is the norm for a founder” (θύειν ὡς νόμος οἰκιστῇ) and arranged horse-races and athletic contests. Malkin, in his discussion of the passage, argues that there must have been a generally accepted norm for the cults of founders and that this cult was manifested by annual commemorations which included sacrifices and feasting.

310

2.4.4. The honouring of heroes

188

With the exception of a few instances, the passages discussed so far in this chapter contain a terminology which in one way or another refers to concrete actions: the killing of a sacrificial victim and how it was handled afterwards. In many cases, however, the literary sources speak of heroes being honoured.

311

The terms most commonly used are τιμᾶν and τιμή or τιμαί or , but a few others are also found, for example, σέβεσθαι and γέρας.

189

What kind of activity is meant, when the literary sources speak of heroes being honoured? Do the sources refer to animal sacrifice, bloodless offerings or other kinds of rituals, for example, the deposition of votives or the holding of contests and the performance of music? Terms used to describe the honours, such as *timan* and *time*, have not received the same attention in the study of the religious terminology as, for example, *thyein*, presumably since these terms have been considered as covering less direct ritual actions.

312

190

According to the *LSJ*, *timan* signifies to honour and revere as men do the gods or the elders, rulers or guests, while *time* is worship, esteem, honour and, in the plural, honours, such as those accorded to gods or to superiors. *Time* underwent a change of meaning from Homeric to Classical times, which is more apparent than the development of *thyein* during the same periods.

313

191

In the Classical period, *time* and *timan* had come to specify the honour which a hero or a god received in cult.

314

Mikalson, in his study of popular religion in Greek tragedy, offers a lengthy discussion on the meaning and use of *time*, which he considers as the essential element of Greek piety, defining it both as the “honour” and the “office” or “function” for which one receives honour.

315

If a god or a hero has *time*, it means that he is worshipped with sanctuaries, dedications, hymns, dances, libations, rituals, prayers, festivals and, above all, sacrifices.

316

Thus, it is important also to look into the honouring of heroes when investigating sacrificial rituals.

192

In the case of hero-cults, the honours given refer to some kind of cult with sacrifices taking place. On this level, the terms referring to honours function more or less as *thyein* does in the evidence discussed previously. However, the sacrifices covered by *timan* and *time* can include animal victims, but in some cases the offerings seem

to have been bloodless. The use of *time* and *timai* as meaning sacrifices of various kinds can be illustrated by how the terms are used in Herodotos' description of the cult of the Hyperborean maidens on Delos.

317

193

Herodotos tells the story of how the Hyperboreans sent offerings to Delos with two maidens, Hyperoche and Laodike, who were escorted by five men. This group never made it back to the Hyperboreans. Both Hyperoche and Laodike and their escort, the latter called the Perpherees by the Delians, are said to be honoured on Delos. The Perpherees were given great honours (τιμὰς μεγάλας ... ἔχοντες), which Herodotos does not specify further.

318

Hyperoche and Laodike were also honoured by the Delians (τιμὴν ἔχουσι).

319

The Delian girls and boys cut their hair and placed it on their tomb, the σῆμα, which was located at an olive-tree on the left-hand side as one entered the Artemision.

320

194

There was also another pair of Hyperborean maidens, Opis and Arge, who were said to have come to Delos earlier than Hyperoche and Laodike and who received another kind of honours (τιμὰς ἄλλας δεδόσθαι).

321

The women of Delos took up collections for them and named them in a hymn. Their tomb, the θήκη, was located behind the temple of Artemis, facing east, close to the banqueting-hall of the people of Keos.

322

Finally, Herodotos says that the ashes from the thigh-bones burnt upon the altar (τῶν μηρίων καταγιζομένων ἐπὶ τῷ βωμῷ τὴν σποδόν) were used for throwing upon the θήκη.

195

This passage is fairly explicit about the kinds of honours which the two pairs of Hyperborean maidens received.

323

In the case of Hyperoche and Laodike, the only offerings mentioned

are the cut-off hair placed on the *sema*, and there may have been no sacrifice of animal victims.

324

The honours paid to Opis and Arge are said to be different, *timai allai*, from those given to Hyperoche and Laodike. A collection was made by the women of Delos, which must have been a form of ritual begging,

325

as well as the singing of hymns, but Opis and Arge were also given the ashes from the thigh-bones burnt upon the *bomos*. Whom did this altar belong to? The common interpretation has been to consider the *bomos* as belonging to Artemis or Apollon, but that identification is a modern inference, since the text does not mention any particular owner of the altar.

326

Since Herodotos says “the ashes of the thigh-bones burnt on the altar are used to cast upon the *theke* of Opis and Arge”, it is possible to identify this altar as that of the Hyperborean maidens.

327

If that was the case, the cult of Opis and Arge must have consisted of a regular *thysia*, at which the divine portion, the thigh-bones, was burnt on the altar and the rest of the meat was consumed by the worshippers. In any case, Opis and Arge were given the ashes from a *thysia* sacrifice.

328

196

From the usage of *timai* in Herodotos, it is clear that the term could be used for sacrifices of a non-edible kind, such as hair, but perhaps also for regular animal sacrifices, depending on how the text is interpreted. Examples of both kinds of usage can be found also in other texts.

197

The war dead at Plataiai were honoured with clothes, customary gifts and *aparchai* consisting of fruits of the season [from the earth (ἐπιμῶμεν κατὰ ἔτος ἕκαστον δημοσίᾳ ἐσθήμασί τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις νομίμοις, ὅσα τε ἡ γῆ ἡμῶν ἀνεδίδου ὥραϊα, πάντων ἀπαρχὰς ἐπιφέροντες).

329

In this case, it seems as if animal sacrifice was not part of the ceremonies and that the *aparchai* of fruits may have been offered at

theoxenia.

330

The clothes could either have been burnt, as the garments given to Periander's wife Melissa had to be, for her to enjoy them in Hades, or deposited whole somewhere, as is known from sanctuaries, Brauron, for example.

331

198

A definite case of *timan* referring to rituals which included animal sacrifice is the way the term is used in Euripides' *Erechtheus* discussed previously. In this passage, Athena instructs the Athenians to honour, *timân*, the Hyakinthids annually with *thysiai*, *sphagai* and choruses.

332

Here, *timan* is used in a general sense, covering a whole set of rituals, for which the particular actions are designated by special terms.

199

A similar usage is found in Thucydides when he is speaking of the worship of Brasidas at Amphipolis, to whom the Amphipolitans τιμὰς δεδῶκασιν ἁγῶνας καὶ ἐτησίους θυσίας, i.e., honours comprising games and annual *thysiai*.

333

When Brasidas was adopted as the new founder and saviour of the city, Hagnon, the original founder of Amphipolis, was deprived of the *timai* he used to receive. The *timai* accorded to Hagnon have usually been considered as being the same as the *timai* given to Brasidas.

334

It seems plausible that both Hagnon and Brasidas would have received *timai* in the form of animal sacrifices and games in their aspects as founders of the city.

335

200

To take the honours as referring to sacrifices of animal victims followed by ritual dining is probably the best interpretation also in other oikist cults, since communal feasting seems to have formed the essential part of the cult of the oikist.

336

Timesios of Klazomenai, the original founder of Abdera, who was later driven out by the Thracians, received honours from the people of Teos (τιμὰς ... ὡς ἥρωας ἔχει), who founded a new colony on the same site in 544 BC.

Battos, the founder of Kyrene, is said to be a *.rwv laosebãv*, “a hero honoured by the people” and had his tomb in the agora.

Euphron, the leader of the popular party at Sikyon, was killed in 364 BC by his political opponents when in Thebes.

The Sikyonians brought him home, buried him in the agora and revered him as the founder (*archegetes*) of the city (ὡς ἀρχηγέτην τῆς πόλεως σέβονται).

Another group of recipients of honours are the war dead. It has commonly been pointed out that, even though the war dead received an established cult in most Greek cities, the sources are often unwilling to elaborate on the details.

It is therefore interesting to note that the worship of the war dead is often described in terms referring to honours. The public honouring of the war dead at Plataiai mentioned by Thucydides has already been commented upon.

The Athenian war dead, who were buried at public expense in the Kerameikos, are described as receiving honours and the sources often stress the honour of being buried by the state, more than the fact that they were also the focus of a continuous cult. Thucydides speaks only of *timai* in connection with the funeral.

Lysias mentions the public funeral and the following games and further states that the war dead were worthy of receiving the same honours as the immortals (ταῖς αὐχαῖς τιμαῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀθανάτους τιμᾶσθαι).

In Plato's *Menexenos*, the city honours (τιμῶσα) the war dead with a public version of the private funerary rituals (*ta nomizomena*), athletic games, horse-races and music.

Demosthenes speaks about the deathless honours (ἀγήρως τιμάς) for the war dead, as well as a public monument, *thysiai* and games.

The importance of the worship of the war dead in Athens makes it likely that the rituals did not consist only of offerings of clothes and fruit, as was the case of the war dead buried at Plataiai. It is probable that, in Athens, animal victims were sacrificed and that *timan* and *timai* should be interpreted as referring to such sacrifices, in particular, since these honours are defined as consisting of *thysiai* in one case.

347

The frequent usage of *timan* and *timai* may be understood as playing down the religious aspect in the treatment of the war dead.

202

A final example of *timai*, which may correspond to animal sacrifice, is found in the *Funeral speech* by Hypereides.

348

Here, the orator complains that the Athenians are now forced to bring *thysiai* to ordinary men and, while the statues, altars and temples of the gods are left without care, those belonging to living men are being taken care of. Furthermore, the Athenians have to honour the servants of these men as heroes (ὥσπερ ἥρωας τιμᾶν ... ἀναγκαζομένους). This passage concerns the conditions in Athens in 323 BC, when cults had been instituted both to Alexander and to Hephaistion.

349

It is difficult to say whether the difference in terminology--*thysiai*, statues, altars and temples for the gods and simply *timai* for the heroes--reflects a distinction in rank between gods and heroes.

350

Alexander and Hephaistion seem to have been intimately united in cult, and the use of *thysiai* and *timai* may just be a way of varying the language.

351

On the other hand, if the equating of Hephaistion with a hero was intended to diminish his importance as compared with Alexander, it is possible that *timai* should be understood as rituals less elaborate than animal sacrifice.

352

203

As in the case of *thyein*, there is a handful of passages in which *timan* or other terms for honours paid to heroes are used without any

further specifications of what was done. In one of the orations by Isokrates, the Plataians urge the Athenians to help them against Thebes, giving as one of the reasons for demanding support that they were concerned for the monument of the fallen Greeks at Plataiai, lest it should be damaged and the gods and heroes of the site would not receive their rightful *timai*.

353

A fragment of Alkman refers to the cult of Menelaos, who is mentioned as being honoured (τιμᾶσθαι) at Therapne, together with the Dioskouroi.

354

Helen is mentioned a few lines further down in the same fragment (line 10) and her name is followed by a *kai*, which may indicate that she also had a companion or companions. Helen and her company may also have been honoured, if the [τιμ] ἄς ἔχουσιν (line 13) later in the fragment refers to them. Pindar speaks of Iolaos being honoured (γέρας ἔχει) at Thebes, just as Perseus was at Argos.

355

Preceding this statement, Pindar mentions that Tydeus and Meleager, the sons of Oineus, were given *thysiai* by the Aitolians. The *geras* accorded to Iolaos and Perseus were probably also some kind of sacrifices, presumably *thysiai*. Aristotle states that men of talent are honoured everywhere (τιμῶσιν) and further quotes the orator Alkidamas, according to whom the Parians honoured (τετιμῆκασιν) Archilochos, in spite of his evil tongue, the Chians Homer, although he had rendered no public services, the Mytilenians Sappho, although she was a woman, the Italiotes Pythagoras, and the Lampsakenes buried Anaxagoras, although he was a foreigner, and honour him still (τιμῶσιν ἔτι καὶ νῦν).

356

According to the Aristotelian work *On marvelous things heard*, Philoktetes was honoured (τιμᾶσθαι) among the Sybarites.

357

Two fragments from plays by Euripides also mention unspecified honours given to heroes. In the *Antiope*, Amphion and Zetos will receive the greatest honours (τιμὰς μεγέστας) at Thebes, while the *timai* accorded to Hippolytos at Troizen are mentioned in a fragment of the first and now lost version of the *Hippolytos*.

358

A final and slightly different case to consider is the treatment of the Spartan kings after their death. Xenophon says that a dead king was given *timai* after he had died, and that in this manner the laws of Lykourgos show that they honour the kings of the Spartans not as mortal men but as heroes (οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλ' ὡς ἥρωας ... προτετιμῆσιν).

359

There has been some argument as to whether this statement should be taken to mean that the kings became heroes, honoured in cult after they had died, or that they only received exceptional funerals, since they had an inherent heroic quality from birth but got no continuous honours after their burial.

360

Considering the usage of *timan* and *timai* for definite, continuous hero-cults, such as those of the oikists, it seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that the dead kings were treated as heroes with proper cults. Xenophon's terminology may be compared with the cautious attitude to the religious position of the war dead found in other sources. Even if a cult did exist, it was not emphasized.

2.5. The specification of the sacrifice as ὡς ἥρω

It has been noted above that some sacrifices to heroes are specified as ὡς ἥρω. This addition has been taken to indicate the performance of particular rituals, which in the case of hero-cults would mean a complete destruction of the animal victim and no dining for the worshippers.

361

The addition ὡς ἥρω has been compared with sacrifices specified as ὡς θεῶ, which have been understood as rituals at which the worshippers dined. Since it has been assumed that dining did not take place at sacrifices to heroes, the addition of ὡς ἥρω to the verb *thyein* has caused some problems among modern scholars. The combination θύειν ὡς ἥρω has been viewed as an impossibility and has consequently been explained as a mistake or a careless usage of the terminology by the ancient sources.

362

The expression $\theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}$ used for a sacrifice to a hero, on the other hand, has been considered as a conscious choice, indicating that the recipient differed from regular heroes, most frequently by not having died a proper death or by not having any grave.

363

206

The problem of interpreting $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \eta\rho\omega$ as referring to particular sacrificial rituals concerns not only the fact that some ancient sources have to be dismissed as *sprachlich nicht korrekt*, since they use this addition with *thyein*.

364

A review of the expression $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \eta\rho\omega$ shows that it is used with *thyein*, *timan*, *entemnein* and *enagizein* alike, terms with highly varied meanings (see Table 31).

207

To add $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \eta\rho\omega$ to *enagizein* in order to mark the presence of rituals particular to hero-cults seems unwarranted, since in the Classical and Hellenistic periods this term was, anyway, used only for sacrifices to heroes and the dead and never for the cult of the gods.

365

Entemnein is also connected in particular with hero-sacrifices and would therefore need no further elucidation.

366

Moreover, which kind of ritual should be considered as being the most typical for heroes and correspond to $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \eta\rho\omega$? The review of the epigraphical and literary sources indicates that sacrifices to heroes were mostly of the alimentary kind, while destruction sacrifices and blood rituals were uncommon. A hero could of course receive destruction sacrifices (*enagizein*) or blood rituals (*entemnein*), since these were among the rituals performed to heroes, but a hero could also, and did frequently, receive *thysia* sacrifices followed by dining. It is therefore not possible to argue that $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \eta\rho\omega$ is automatically to be taken as indicating *enagizein* or *entemnein* sacrifices. On the whole, the interpretation of $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \eta\rho\omega$ as referring to ritual practices for heroes differing from the cult of the gods rests upon the assumption that the sacrifices to heroes were ritually distinct from those to the gods.

Expression	Recipient	Category	Source
<i>Thyein</i> or the equivalent			
θύειν ὡς ἥρω	Onesilos	Hero	Hdt. 5.114
θύουσι ... ὡς ἥρω	Artachaies	Hero	Hdt. 7.117
θύουσι ὡς νόμος αἰαστῆ	Milliades	Oikist	Hdt. 6.38
ὡς θανάτω ... θύουσι	Herakles	Immortal (god)	Hdt. 2.44
ῥοταται ... ἀρχαίται· ὥσπερ θεῶ, μύλων τε τραυσάεσσα πομπῇ	Tapolemos	God	Pind. Ol. 7.78–80
θύσιαι ... ἀποτελοῦσιν οὐχ ὡς ἥρωσιν ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῖς	Helen and Menelaos	Gods	Isoc. Hel. 63
<i>Timan</i> or the equivalent			
τιμᾶς ... ὡς ἥρω	Timesios	Hero	Hdt. 1.168
οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλ' ὡς ἥρωας ... προσημύχουσιν	Dead Spartan kings	Heroes	Xen. Lac. 15.9
ὡς ἀρχηγέτην τῆς πόλεως σέβονται	Euphron	Archegetes	Xen. Heli. 7.3.12
ὥσπερ ἥρωας τιμᾶν	Servants of the Macedonians (Hephaistion)	Heroes	Hyp. Epitaph. 21
<i>Entemnein</i>			
ὡς ἥρωι τε ἐντέμνουσι	Brasidas	Hero	Thuc. 5.11
<i>Enagizein</i> or the equivalent			
ὡς ἥρω ἐναγίζουσι	Herakles	Hero	Hdt. 2.44
θύομεν ὡς αὐτοῖσι τοῖς ἐναντίοις ὥσπερ θεοῖσι	The dead	Gods	Ar. Tag. fr. 504, 12–13 (PCG III.2)

208

The alternative interpretation of ὡς ἥρω has no bearing on the contents of the rituals but concerns the status of the recipient.

367

If the addition . ὡς ἥρω is viewed from this angle, it would constitute a means of indicating that the recipient belonged to the category of heroes. Similarly, θύειν ὡς θεῷ defines the recipient as being a god and σέβεσθαι ὡς ἀρχηγέτην as an *archegetes*. The *thyein* ὡς ἥρω to Onesilos and Artachaies, the honouring of Timesios ὡς ἥρω, the *entemnein* ὡς ἥρω to Brasidas and the *enagizein* ὡς ἥρω to Herakles would mean that all these recipients were considered as being heroes and not any other kind of divine beings.

368

Likewise, Euphron of Sikyon, who was honoured as ὡς ἀρχηγέτην τῆς πόλεως, belonged to the category of *archegetai*.

369

209

The importance of the religious status is especially obvious when it is emphasized that the recipient belonged to one particular category and not to another. When Isokrates speaks of the cult of Helen and

Menelaos at Sparta, he makes a point of stressing that the couple were receiving holy and traditional *thysiai*, not as heroes but as being gods (θυσίας αὐτοῖς ἁγίας καὶ πατρίας ἀποτελοῦσιν οὐχ ὡς ἥρωσιν ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῖς ἀμφοτέροις οὔσιν).

370

Similarly, the dead Spartan kings were honoured, not as ordinary men, but as heroes (οὐ ὡς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλ' ὡς ἥρωας ... προτετιμήκασιν).

371

The only case in which the addition seems to concern the ritual practices is the worship of Miltiades among the Chersonesitai. Here, however, it is indicated that the people of Chersonesos “sacrifice as is the norm for a founder” (θύουσι ὡς νόμος οἱ ἱμιστῆ), a ritual presumably centred on an annual, solemn feast.

372

210

In the examples discussed so far, the recipients are considered as *being* heroes, oikists, *archegetai* or gods and it was argued that the additions were meant to clarify their status, not to indicate any particular rituals. In a few cases, the addition is not ὡς ἥρω or ὡς θεῶ but ὥσπερ ἥρωας or ὥσπερ θεῶ/θεοῖσι. The meaning of this addition is less clear and can, in fact, both refer to the status of the recipient and to the rituals they receive.

211

In the first example, the status of the recipient must be the issue. Hypereides complains about the Athenians having to perform *thysia* and erect statues, altars and temples to their Macedonian overlords and honour their servants as heroes (ὥσπερ ἥρωας τιμᾶν), a passage taken to refer to the cult of Alexander and Hephaistion.

373

The point being made is not that the servants (or Hephaistion) were considered as *being* heroes, but that they had to be honoured *as if they were heroes*, i.e., Athenians had to show them an excessive amount of respect. A certain degree of irony can be detected here. The fact that the servants had to be treated as heroes, while the masters were gods, may have been a means for indicating that the former were of lesser status than the latter. In any case, the passage is to be taken as having a bearing on the status of the recipients of the honours rather than as a sign of there being particular ritual practices for heroes, distinct

from those of the gods.

212

A second, slightly different case, in which the same construction is found, concerns the cult of the mythical founder of Dorian Rhodes, Tlapolemos. Pindar, in his seventh *Olympian Ode*, states that on Rhodes “is established for Tlapolemos, the Tirynthians’ colony-founder, as if for a god, a procession of rich sacrificial flocks and the judging of athletic contests” (Τλαπολέμῳ ἴσταται Τίρυνθίων ἀρχαγέτα, ὥσπερ θεῶ, μῆλων χε κνισάεσσα πομπὰ καὶ κρίσις ἀμφ’ ἀέθλοις).

374

Tlapolemos is an *archegetes* and not a god, but he is given sacrifices as if he were a god. The rituals to Tlapolemos are of a kind commonly performed to the gods but they may as well be found in a cult of an *archegetes*. The meaning intended here, seems to have been a wish to show the extent to which he was honoured and the fact that, though an *archegetes*, he was worshipped on the same scale as a god.

375

213

Here can also be considered an interesting fragment of Aristophanes’ *Tagenistai*.

376

The speaker in the text states that “we are sacrificing *enagismata* to them (the dead) as if they were gods, and we are pouring out *choai*, begging them to send up the good things here” (θύομεν † αὐτοῖσι τοῖς ἐναγίσμασιν ὥσπερ θεοῖσι, καὶ χοάς γε χεόμενοι αἰτούμεθ’ αὐτοὺς δεῦρ’ ἀνιέναι τὰγαθά). Also in this case, the rituals themselves do not seem to be the main issue. In this period, the gods would not be recipients of *enagismata* and the stipulation that the dead were to be given these offerings “as to the gods” clearly has no bearing on them being gods nor of the gods actually receiving *enagismata*. Intended is rather the unusual situation that the dead are receiving a substantial amount of offerings, just as the gods, although the departed normally would be given comparably poor offerings. The use of *thyein* can also be taken as an indication of the exceptional character of these sacrifices, since this term is, as a rule, not used for rituals for the ordinary Greek dead in this period.

377

214

Why, then, was there a need to specify the religious status of the recipient in some cases? In general, the denominations *heros* and *theos* seem to have been used in quite a flexible manner.

378

It is interesting to note that most of the passages defining the recipient as a hero, an oikist or an *archegetes* concern the institution of the cults in one way or another. When Herodotos speaks of the *thyein* ὡς ἥρωε sacrifices to Onesilos and Artachaies, it is in describing the background of the cults and the circumstances of their institution.

379

The cults of Euphron at Sikyon and Brasidas at Amphipolis were also new cults, even though Brasidas replaced Hagnon in many respects.

380

The worship of Timesios at Abdera was probably newly established by the second group of colonists of the site.

381

The honouring of the dead Spartan kings can also be said to concern the institution of cults, since the elevation of the kings to heroes took place only in connection with their burial.

382

At the institution of a new cult, it seems to have been of importance to define the status of the recipient.

383

Furthermore, it cannot be a coincidence that so many of these cults concern founders, whether they were the actual founders or not or only later adopted as such: Miltiades at Chersonesos, Timesios at Abdera, Euphron at Sikyon, Brasidas at Amphipolis and Tlapolemos on Rhodes. After his death, the founder received a hero-cult, but it still seems to have been of interest whether he was to be called a hero, an oikist or an *archegetes*.

215

The link between the addition ὡς ἥρωε and the religious status of the recipient is further supported by the role played by oracles in the institution of the cults. It is well known that Delphi in many cases ordered the recovery of the bones of a hero and the foundation of a cult.

384

The sacrifices to Onesilos and Artachaies described by Herodotos were both begun on the command of an oracle. Delphi also played an

important role in the creation of oikist cults, since it was the oracle which appointed the oikist, who, when he died, received a hero-cult.

385

When the oracle decided on the institution of a cult, it is possible that it also decided upon the status of the recipient as a hero, an oikist or an *archegetes*. The importance of the epithet and the role of an oracle in these matters are clear from Plato, when he speaks of the guardians and leaders of the state, who, after their death, will depart to the Island of the Blessed and dwell there.

386

Plato says that the state should establish *mnemeia* and *thysiai* for them, as *daimones* (ὥς δαίμονιν), if the Pythia approves, and, if not, as divine *jeíoiv* and godlike men (ὥς εὐδαίμοσι τε καὶ θείοις). The distinction here does not lie in different kinds of rituals, since in both cases *mnemeia* and *thysiai* will be established, but in the designation of the recipients and how their religious status was to be perceived, a decision made by the oracle.

2.6. Conclusion: Sacrifices to heroes from the literary evidence

216

The picture of sacrifices to heroes presented in the literary sources is basically the same as that given by the review of the epigraphical evidence, but there are some distinctions, which mainly depend on the particular character of each category of evidence.

217

Direct evidence for destruction sacrifices and blood rituals is not abundant in the literary evidence. The sources offer few details as to the execution of the destruction sacrifices, but the blood rituals always seem to have been performed in connection with *thysia* sacrifices, presumably constituting the initial ritual of a sacrifice ending with dining. The evidence for *theoxenia* is scarce and less direct than in the inscriptions, but it is clear that this kind of ritual could be used both as a main ritual and as a complement to animal sacrifice.

218

The texts specifically indicating animal sacrifice followed by dining

are few, if compared with the epigraphical evidence. This is not surprising, considering the fact that the literary sources often mention the hero-sacrifices in passing when discussing non-religious subjects, while one of the primary aims of the inscriptions was to regulate the handling of the meat. The bulk of the literary texts use *thyein* or *thysia* in describing the sacrifices. In most cases, however, the contexts support an interpretation of the ritual as animal sacrifice followed by dining. A number of texts also speak of heroes receiving honours, a terminology almost unknown in the epigraphical sources, but best interpreted as referring to a proper cult with sacrifices, either of animals or of less substantial offerings.

219

The lack of detail in the majority of the literary references to hero-cults can in itself be taken as an indication of the ritual intended. When no specifics were given, the sacrifice performed must have been of the most common kind, which meant a ritual at which the worshippers dined. The fact that some sacrifices are specified as destruction sacrifices, blood rituals or *theoxenia* supports the notion that these sacrifices were unusual and therefore commented upon, rather than that rituals of this kind were common in hero-cults

Notes

1 The term “destruction sacrifice” is a modern construct, which does not correspond to “destruction” in the sense covered by φθειρω. Here, “destruction” refers to the treatment of the offerings from the point of view of the human worshippers, who at these sacrifices received less meat than usual or no meat at all. The divinity, on the other hand, received his share of the sacrifice, which was even larger than at a regular *thysia*.

2 *Theoxenia* here covers the same actions as those included in the recent treatment of the subject by Michael Jameson (1994a).

3 For libations to heroes as independent rituals not performed in connection with animal sacrifice, see below, p. 179, n. 213. On heroes and wineless libations, see Henrichs 1983, 93–100, esp. 98–99 with n. 58.

4 Cf. a regulation of the relations between Argos, Knossos and Tyllissos, dated to c.

450 BC, which contains a number of sacrifices (see Meiggs & Lewis 1988, no. 42). For a comparison between the early epigraphical evidence from Attica and Crete, though not only inscriptions with a religious connection, see Stoddart & Whitley 1988, 763–767.

5 Peloponnese: Corinth has yielded few inscriptions before the Roman period (see Dow 1942, 113–119 for possible explanations) and of these only two have a religious content: a sacred law from the temple of Apollon, Meritt 1931, no. 1, with a new fragment, Robinson 1976, 230–231 = SEG 26, 1976–77, 393, pre-570 BC, and a *horos* from the Sacred Spring *temenos*, Meritt 1931, no. 22 = LSS 34, c. 475 BC. On the early Spartan inscriptions, see Cartledge 1978, 35–36. Kyrene: LSS 115, late 4th century BC; for the extensive bibliography on this inscription, as well as a translation and discussion, see Parker 1983, 332–351; cf. Malkin 1987, 206–212. Selinous: Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993; Kernos 12, 1999, 234–235, no. 45.

6 Athens has produced more inscriptions than any other city state, and not only regarding religious matters (see Hedrick 1994, 160–161). For example, Athenian inscriptions occupy more IG space than entire regions of ancient Greece.

7 In later periods, however, when there is more comparative material from other regions, the attitudes to the heroes and heroization (but not necessarily to sacrificial rituals) seem to have been different in Attica, as compared with elsewhere, see Parker 1996, 276; see also above, p. 18, n. 18. Heroization of regular mortals, for example, is less common in Attica than in other regions, as is clear from the use of the term *heros* on tombstones, see Fraser 1977, 77; Guarducci 1974, 152–153; Craik 1980, 175–176; Graf 1985, 129, n. 56.

8 So does the archaeological evidence for hero-cults (see Abramson 1978; Antonaccio 1995, 145–197; Boehringer 2001; Pariente 1992, 205–211; Ekroth 1998), which I hope to be able to deal with later.

9 The definition of a hero-sacrifice as Greek or barbarian is sometimes difficult, for example, a sacrifice prescribed by Delphi but executed by a non-Greek population or a cult by non-Greeks of a Greek recipient. The geographical division of the passages is as follows: Attica 14, Peloponnese 10, central Greece 8, the Aegean islands 5, northern Greece 4, Ionia 3, Italy 2, Sicily 1, Cyprus 1, Kyrene 2, Media 2 and general contexts that cannot be tied to a particular geographical location 6.

10 L¹ 18: Epops, col. IV, 20–23, and col. V, 12–15; Basile, col. II, 16–20.

11 Hollis 1990, 127–130; Callim. *Aet.* fr. 238, line 11 (*Suppl. Hell.* 1983). Epops was perhaps related to the hoopoe (see Kearns 1989, 159).

12 Stengel 1910, 187–190; Radke 1936, 26–29.

13 Kearns 1989, 151; Shapiro 1986, has collected the available evidence on Basile. In Athens, Basile, together with Kodros and Neleus, had a substantial *temenos*, in which at least 200 olivetrees could be planted (IG I³ 84, 418/7 BC).

14 L¹ 19, 84.

15 See below, pp. 153–157.

16 L¹ 20 B, 14. Cults of Ioleos are known also from other regions than Attica, but

only from later sources (see Kearns 1989, 172–173).

17 Van Straten 1995, 158, n. 144.

18 In support of the notion of private sacrifices involving the priests of the *genos*, Ferguson (1938, 42) pointed out that the priest of Eurysakes was also the priest of the Hero at the Hale and received the skin and the leg of the victims which were sacrificed to that hero, τῶν θυομένων λαμβάνειν τὸ δέρμα καὶ τὸ σιέλος (LSS 19, 37–39). *Ton thyomenon* must refer to the animals sacrificed by private persons rather than to the single sheep sacrificed to the Hero at the Hale by the *genos* (line 85).

19 Ferguson 1938, 42. Sacrificed swine are sometimes called εὐστά in the inscriptions. They do not seem to have yielded any skins: they were singed and the rind must presumably have been eaten (see Ziehen 1899, 267–274; Stengel 1920, 112, n. 21; Jameson 1988, 107–108).

20 It was probably a wether, a castrated ram (see van Straten 1995, 181–186).

21 For this group of terms, see Casabona 1966, 155–196. The earliest use of any of these terms in an inscription concerning hero-cults is the 2nd-century BC foundation of Kritolaos from Amorgos, which prescribes that a ram is to be slaughtered (σφαζάτωσαν), boiled whole and used for prizes at the games for the heroized Aleximachos (LSS 61, 75–81 = IG XII:7 515 = Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 50).

22 LSS 64, 7–22 = Pouilloux 1954b, no. 141.

23 Casabona 1966, 226–229; Rudhardt 1958, 285–286. *Entemnein* has been restored for a hero-sacrifice in a cult regulation from Kos (LS 156 A, 10), dating to 300–250 BC. According to the restoration proposed by Herzog (1928, no. 5; followed by Sokolowski, LS 156 A), a priestess cannot personally sacrifice to Hekate or to the chthonian gods, nor sacrifice (*entamnetai*) to the heroes of the nether world, nor step on a *heroon* (μηδὲ παρ' Ἐκάτας Μεγάλ[ας μηδὲ ὅσσα τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς χθονί] οἰς θύεται, μηδὲ ὅσσα τοῖς ἐνε[ρτέροις ἥρωσιν ἐντάμνεται, μηδὲ ἐμ] πατεῖν ἡρώιον, lines 8–10).

24 Pouilloux 1954b, 373–374 and 377; Casabona 1966, 227; commentary on LSS 64, line 10, by Sokolowski; cf. Krummen 1990, 71–72.

25 LSS 64, commentary on line 12; cf. Pouilloux 1954b, 374.

26 Cf. Casabona 1966, 226–227.

27 For the use of this term, see Jameson 1994a, 36–37; Gill 1974, 122–123; Gill 1991, 11.

28 LSS 69, 3 = Salviat 1958, 195.

29 Salviat 1958, 198–212; LSS 69, commentary p. 127.

30 Salviat 1958, 254–259; Jameson 1994a, 36 with n. 6. Among the other festivals mentioned in the same inscription are the *Herakleia* and the *Dioskouria*, i.e., festivals to divinities who often received *theoxenia* (see Jameson 1994a, 46–48).

31 The *Heroxeinia* festival has been connected with various Thasian heroes, such as the *Agathoi* killed in war (Salviat 1958, 259; Dunant & Pouilloux 1958, 97) and Herakles (Bergquist, forthcoming). Ἡρωιξεῖνιά is found in another Thasian

inscription of substantially later date (Dunant & Pouilloux 1958, no. 192, line 23; 1st century AD). In this case, the two *euergetai* Euphrillos and Mikas were given parts in the *heroixeinia* and also received sacrifices of bulls (βουθυτεῖσθαι ... ταύρους) and games on their anniversary.

32 Rotroff 1978, 196–197, lines 4–13 = SEG 28, 1978, 53. Among the silver listed were ten kylikes belonging to the Eponymous Heroes, which led Rotroff to suggest that the hero was one of the Eponymoi, possibly Leos. Lewis 1979 argued that it is more likely that the kylikes were stored in an important civic building, for example, the *Strategoion*, and that the hero could have been *Strategos*.

33 Rotroff 1978, 203; Jameson 1994a, 50 with n. 55. Cf. the foundation of Diomedon on Kos (LS 177, 120–130 = Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 45; cf. Sherwin-White 1977, 210–213; late 4th to early 3rd century BC) listing the *theoxenia* equipment of Herakles Diomedonteios: two lampstands, two lamps, a grill (*eschara*), a krater, a rug, a table, five gilt wreaths for the statue, two clubs, three incense-burners and one couch. For the *eschara*, see above, p. 31.

34 Gill 1991, 10.

35 Jameson 1994a, 40; Gill 1991, 10.

36 Jameson 1994a, 39–40.

37 Jameson 1994a, 37–41.

38 Cf. Jameson 1994a, 41, for similar cases concerning gods.

39 LSS 20, 12–23 = Meritt 1942, 282–287, no. 55 = Ferguson 1944, 73–79, Class A, no. 1. The inscription was cut in the early 3rd century BC, but the decree containing the information on the sacrifices dates to the mid 5th century (see Ferguson 1944, 76; Jameson 1994a, 41). The hero is named Echelos in the 3rd-century part of the inscription (lines 4–5).

40 LSS 20, 14–15. For the interpretation of *teleon* as a sheep, see van Straten 1995, 173, n. 53; Rosivach 1994, 24, n. 42 and 150–151.

41 LS 20 B, 23–24.

42 LS 20 B, 25.

43 LS 20 B, 3–4.

44 That seems to have been the case in an early-4th-century law from a tribe or a deme: the priestess of the Heroine was to get certain portions of meat from the *trapeza* (LS 28, 8–9 = IG II² 1356).

45 Daux 1983, 153–154: lines 16–17, a sheep to Kephalos and a *trapeza* to Prokris; lines 18–19, a selected sheep to Thorikos and a *trapeza* to the Heroines of Thorikos; lines 28–30, a cow to Thorikos and a *trapeza* to the Heroines of Thorikos; lines 48–49, a sheep to Hyperpedios and a *trapeza* to the Heroines of Hyperpedios; lines 50–51, a piglet to Pylouchos and a *trapeza* to the Heroines of Pylouchos. The *trapeza* to Philonis (line 44) probably went, together with the preceding sacrifice of a pregnant sheep, to Demeter (lines 43–44) (see Parker 1987, 145) and a sheep to Zeus Herkeios (added to the right-hand side of the stone at the level of line 44). On the lesser status of heroines in the Attic sacrificial calendars, see Larson 1995, 26–34.

- 46**LS 11 A, 6, 12 and 16 = IG I³ 255 A, 4, 10 and 14; cf. Jameson 1994a, 39.
- 47** The cult of Hippolytos seems always to have been connected with that of Aphrodite and her name has been restored in LS 11 A, 5 and IG I³ 255 A, 4 (see commentaries to each edition).
- 48** Jameson 1994a, 39. The other two tables are used for Zeus Tropaïos and Herakles (LS 11 A, 9–10) and for Apollon Pythios, probably together with another recipient (LS 11 A, 13–15?).
- 49**LS 1 A, 17–19 = IG I³ 234 A; c. 480–460 BC; cf. Jameson 1994a, 39.
- 50** Gill 1991, 7–11; Jameson 1994a, 37. For cakes at *thysia*, see Kearns 1994, 65–67.
- 51**LS 38, 10–13 = IG II² 1195; late 4th century BC; cf. Kearns 1994, 65–70.
- 52**LS 2 C, 2–4 = IG I³ 246D, 29–32; c. 470–450 BC.
- 53**LS 151 C, 2–8. The beginning of line 2, in which the recipients were named, is lost. Paton & Hicks 1891, no. 39, restored the line as τοῖς ἥρωι (σ) ιν οἱ [ιαρεῖς(ς) οἷε τελέω; Herzog 1928, no. 3 proposed ἥρωσι, πᾶσιν(?) οἷε [ς τρεῖς τέλει, followed by Segre 1993, no. ED 140; Sokolowski, LS 151 C, suggested βασιλεῦσιν οἷ [ες τρεῖς τέλει.
- 54** Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 35–36.
- 55** Jameson 1994a, 56 with n. 83; Gill 1991, 15–19.
- 56**LS 28, 8–9 = IG II² 1356: ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν τράπεζαν κ[ω]λῆν, πλευρὸν ἰσχίῳ, ἡμίκρα[ιραν χορδ] ἦς. For the identification of the parts, see Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 14 and 20.
- 57**LSS 20. For the date, see above, p. 138, n. 39.
- 58** For the interpretation of *teleon* as a sheep, see above, p. 138, n. 40. Ferguson 1944, 74, n. 16, and 77, argues that an ox was also sacrificed when funds were available (line 20, [ἄν ἦι, β]οῦς).
- 59** For different interpretations, see Meritt 1942, 287; Ferguson 1944, 73–76, and LSS 20, commentary.
- 60** Meritt 1942, 286.
- 61** Lines 6–7, τ[ὸν βωμὸν] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ; cf. Ferguson 1944, 79.
- 62**LS 10 C, 4–9 = IG I³ 244 C; c. 460 BC.
- 63**LS 10 C, 5. The stone is damaged. Wilamowitz 1887, 255, suggested λέχ[σιν δύο ὀ]βολῶν; LS 10 C, λέχ[σιν III ὀ]βολῶν; Berthiaume 1982, 63, three obols. IG I³ 244 C offers no restoration.
- 64**LSS 19, 19–24.
- 65**LS 18, col. I, lines 44–51 (Semele); col. IV, lines 33–40 (Dionysos).
- 66**IG II² 1254, 11–12, dated from after 350 BC, and SEG 37, 1987, 102, c. 300 BC; the latter is quite damaged, but the word *merida* is preserved. For the Paraloi and their sanctuary, see Garland 1987, 131–132, who identifies them with the crew of the sacred trireme Paralos. Cf. Kearns 1989, 193.
- 67**IG VII 235, 25–36 = LS 69; new edition by Petropoulou 1981, 48–49 (= SEG 31, 1981, 416). On the disputed dating of this inscription, early or late 4th century BC, see SEG 31, 1981, 416; SEG 38, 1988, 386; Knoepfler 1986, 96, n. 116; Knoepfler 1992, 452, no.

78; Parker 1996, 148–149.

68LS 28, 5–9 = IG II2 1356; early 4th century. Sokolowski (LS 28, line 6, commentary) suggested that the skins might have come from lambs, [ἀρν] ἰ<ν>ων. Ziehen 1899, 273, n. 1, proposed the restoration [Ἡρω] ἰνίων. For the interpretation of δεισίας κρεῶν (line 6) as portions of meat, see Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 22.

69 See above, p. 140.

70LSS 19, 37–39.

71LSS 19, 31–33. On the lack of skins from the pigs, see p. 134, n. 19.

72LSS 19, lines 84–87, for the recipients: Alkmene, Maia and Ion were given sheep and the Hero of Antisara and the Hero at Pyrgilion a piglet each; cf. Ferguson 1938, 65. Another inscription concerning the Salaminioi, also published by Ferguson (1938, 9–10) and dated to the mid 3rd century BC, speaks of the *temenos* of Herakles at Porthmos as having altars, *bomoi* (lines 8–9). Presumably these altars must have been used for all the sacrifices performed at the Herakleia (see Ferguson 1938, 22 and 71; Woodford 1971, 221). On the location of this sanctuary at Sounion, see Young J.H. 1941, 169–171.

73LS 18: heroines at Pylon, col. I, lines 19–22; heroines at Schoinos, col. V, lines 3–8; Semele, col. I, lines 46–51.

74LS 151 A a: τῶν θυομένων τᾷ Λευκοθῆι, ἀποφορὰ ἐς ἰέρεαν.

75LS 70 = Pouilloux 1954b, no. 129; late 4th to early 3rd century BC. To the examples of priests receiving shares from sacrifices to heroes should perhaps be added LS 11 B (= IG I³ 255 B; c. 430 BC). Lines 8–9 can be reconstructed as [---γλδτ[ταν δὲ τῷ Ἀρ χ εγέτε[ι---] which are perhaps to be interpreted as the tongue from the victim sacrificed to Archegetes being given to the priest. In the Classical period, the tongues were often the prerogative of the priest, see Kadletz 1981, 21–29 (LS 11 B not included).

76 On this particular practice, see Scullion 1994, 99–112, who provides an overview of both the evidence in all kinds of cults and the previous interpretations. Scullion argues that the practice was a sign of chthonian ritual, see further below, pp. 313–325.

77 Petropoulou 1981, 49, lines 31–32, τῶν δὲ κρεῶν μὴ εἶναι ἐκφορὴν ἔξω τοῦ τεμένεος

78LS 18: Heroines at Pylon, col. I, lines 19–22; Semele, col. I, lines 46–51; Herakleidai, col. II, lines 42–44 (*ou phora* added later); Aglauros, col. II, lines 57–59 (*ou phora* added later); Leukaspis, col. III, lines 50–53; Menedeios, col. IV, lines 53–55; Heroines at Schoinos, col. V, lines 3–8.

79 Daux 1983, 153, line 27.

80 Parker 1987, 145–146, commentary on line 11 and lines 26–27. Daux 1983, 155–157, suggested the restoration . Π [Οσειδῶ] and that this line should be connected with the addition . ῶνι, τέλεον Πυανοψίοις on the left-hand side of the stone at the height of line 31. Cf. Rosivach 1994, 23, n. 40.

81IG II² 1496, 134–135 and 143; 334/3 to 331/0 BC. Cf. Jameson 1988, 111–112.

82LS 47, 27–30 = IG II² 2499; 306/5 BC.

83LSJ s.v.; Ferguson 1944, 80; LS 47, commentary on line 29.

84 Ferguson 1944, 80 with n. 27.

85 Trees, line 15. The number of members in these kinds of cult-associations seems to have been quite small. According to Ferguson (1944, 91 and 117), the *orgeones* of Asklepios were 16, while the cult-association of Dionysos had 15 members.

86 See LSJ s.v. for references.

87IG II² 1259, 1–2.

88 For the Amyneion, see also IG II² 1252 + 999 and 1253; Kearns 1989, 147; Kutsch 1913, 12–16 and nos. 14 and 15; Ferguson 1944, 86–91. It has recently been convincingly shown that Dexion does not correspond to the heroized Sophokles, see Connolly 1998, 1–21. For the archaeological remains of the Amyneion, which had a small shrine with a cult table, a stoa for the worshippers to eat and sleep in and a supply of water by a well and presumably also by being connected to a water conduit to the south, see Körte 1893; Körte 1896; Judeich 1931, 289; Travlos 1971, 76–78.

89 Körte 1896, 301–302, in analogy with Hegesandros quoted by Ath. 8.365d: “the contribution brought in to the symposia by the drinkers is called by the Argives *χῶς* (heap)” (transl. Gulick 1930).

90LS 151 C: the beginning of line 2, where the recipients were named, is lost. For the restoration of the recipients as heroes, see above, p. 139, n. 53.

91 On the treatment of *hiera*, see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 35–36. On the interpretation of the *hiera* as part of a *theoxenia* ritual, see above, p. 139.

92LS 151 C, commentary on line 7, *pinax* explained as a tray.

93 Veyne 1983, 286, the *pinax* is thus a part of the actual sacrifice. This practice was more common in Roman sacrifices.

94IG I³ 5 = LS 4; cf. von Prott 1899, 241–266; Clinton 1979, 1–12; Clinton 1992, 83, n. 109.

95IG I³ 5, line 4, Tri. p. Τριπ[τολέμοι, κριόν]

96 On the restoration of [Ιάη]χος line 5, see Clinton 1988, 70–71 with n. 24.

97LSS 10 A, 60–74 = Oliver 1935, 19–32, no. 2; cf. Healey 1984. Oliver places the sacrifices at the Mysteries in Boedromion, while Healey (137) and Sokolowski assign them to the Eleusinia in Metageitnion.

98 Pherrephatte must mean Kore, since she appears after Demeter (see Clinton 1992, 63, n. 199).

99 Melichos (line 66), was formerly read as Delichos; for the correction, see Graf 1974, 139–144. Healey 1984, 139, suggests that Melichos was explicitly called *heros* to distinguish him from Zeus Meilichios. Melichos, Archegetes and Threptos have been considered as cult epithets for Eubouleus, Hippothoon or Eleusis/Eleusinos, and Triptolemos or Demophon, respectively (see Healey 1984, 139–140). Clinton 1992, 101, prefers to identify Threptos with Demophon rather than with Triptolemos.

100LS 19, 19–20 and line 79, θύωσι, αἰεὶ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσι, In line 81, all the sacrifices are called *thysiai*.

101LS 19, 84. See above, pp. 133–134.

102LS 20 B, 2, 23 and 39.

103LS 38, 6–7 and 10–13 = IG II² 1195; late 4th century. The offerings seem to have been bloodless, *popana* and *pelanos*, but may also have included an animal victim, see above, p. 139.

104 Pomtow 1883, nos. 1, 2, 8, 34 and 47; cf. SGDI 3208–3209. The dating of these tablets is difficult but seems mainly to be the 5th–4th centuries BC (see Parke 1967, 259–273).

105LS 64; see above, pp. 135–136.

106IG II² 2501. The mythology of Hypodektes is unknown, like that of Egretes. Kearns 1989, 75 and 202, suggests two possible origins: Hypodektes may either have been originally an underworld god or he may have functioned as the original recipient of the *hiera* from Eleusis in Athens.

107 Ferguson 1944, 82; cf. the Heros Iatros at Athens, who is called *theos* in an inventory, IG II² 839, 20, 33 and 45–46, dated to 221/0 BC.

108 Cult-statues of heroes seem to have been quite rare and mainly found in the cults of major, well-known heroes, often having substantial precincts: Amphiaraios at Oropos, statue base in the temple, Petrakos 1968, 99; Amphiaraios at Rhamnous, mentioned in IG II² 1322, 13, stele to be placed παρὰ τὸν θεόν; Heros Archegetes at Rhamnous, Pouilloux 1954a, no. 26., ἀρχηγέται ἥρωι ἄ[γ]αλμα (cf. Petrakos 1991, 41–42, no. 15, an additional part to the same base); Heros Ptoios at Akraiphiai, inscribed statue base, Perdrizet 1898, 243–245; Helen at Therapne, Hdt 6.61; Lykos, Ar. Av. 819–821.

109IG II² 1262, 6–7, dating from 301/0 BC. For the new reading οἱ Τυνάβου (line 17), see Tracy 1995, 145–146; Mikalson 1998, 147 with n. 28. Kearns 1989, 201, proposes that Tynaros (as his name was read previously) may have been a foreign god rather than a hero, judging from the find-place of the inscription, Piraeus, and the foreign name. Tracy (*ibid.*) suggests an Egyptian origin, while Mikalson (*ibid.*) is in favour of the cult stemming from Cyprus.

110 Ferguson 1944, 123–129.

111LS 11 A, 11–12 = IG I³ 255 A, 13–14.

112IG II² 1357 a, 5 Ἐρχεθεῖ ἄρνενω; late 5th century. LS 31, 7–8 = IG II² 1146, θύεν δ]ὲ ταῦρον καὶ τ---; after 350 BC.

113LS 2 C, 6–10 = IG I³ 246D, 34–37, ἥρωιν ἐμ πεδίῳ: τέλειον ηεκατέρ[οι---]; c. 470–450. Cf. LS 1 A, 12 = IG I³ 234 A, 12, [h]εροῖνει; ἐμ π[---]; c. 480–460.

114 Rougemont 1977, no. 10, line 32. The re-edition of the text by Rougemont replaces IG II² 1126.

115 Rougemont 1977, 113–114; the first interpretation is comparable with ὁ βοῦς ἡγεμῶν (Xen. Hell. 6.4.29)

116 Three of the calendars (Thorikos, Marathon and Erchia) have recently been

discussed by Annie Verbanck-Piérard (1998), whose approach is similar to mine.

117 Eleusis: IG II² 1363, re-edited by Dow & Healey 1965. Teithras: Pollitt 1961 = LSS 132. For an overview of the Athenian sacrificial calendars, see Dow 1968; for the religion of the Attic demes, see Mikalson 1977; Whitehead 1986a, 176–222; Verbanck-Piérard 1998.

118 Daux 1983, 152–154 = Daux 1984, 148 = SEG 33, 1983, 147; Parker 1987, 144–147; Rosivach 1994, 22–29; cf. Whitehead 1986a, 194–199. Daux dates the text to about 385 to 370, but Lewis 1985, 108, Parker 1987, 138 with n. 11, and Jameson 1988, 115, n. 7, all favour a date about 440/430 or 430/420 based on the letter-forms. The beginning of the calendar is partly damaged.

119LS 20 B = IG II² 1358 B; Rosivach 1994, 29–36; cf. Whitehead 1986a, 190–194. The inscription originally covered sacrifices of the organization of the Marathonian Tetrapolis, which was made up of the demes Marathon, Probalinthos, Oinoe and Trikorynthos. Only the deme Marathon is of concern here: the rest are too damaged and also contain no sacrifices to heroes. In the Marathon calendar, a part of the first quarter of the Attic year is missing.

120LS 18; Daux 1963a, 603–634; Jameson 1965, 154–172; Dow 1965, 180–213; Rosivach 1994, 14–21; cf. Whitehead 1986a, 199–204. The calendar is complete, apart from four sacrifices missing at the end. On the interpretation of the title of the calendar, *Demarchia he mezon* (Greater Demarchia), see Daux 1963a; Dow 1965, 188–213; Dow 1968, 182–183; Mikalson 1977, 427–428; Whitehead 1986b, 57–64; Jameson 1988, 115, n. 4; Rosivach 1994, 20–21. The deme Erchia was located south of modern Spata, south-east of Athens (see Vanderpool 1965, 21–24).

121LSS 19; Ferguson 1938, 1–74; Lambert S. 1997, 85–106 (partly correcting Ferguson); Rosivach 1994, 40–45; cf. Parker 1996, 306–316. The text is completely preserved.

122 In the Erchia calendar (LS 18), one sacrifice lacks an indication of date, col. II, lines 37–39, a sheep given to Hera at the end of Gamelion. Indications of dates in the other calendars: Thorikos (Daux 1983, 153): the 16th of Pyanopsion (line 26), a *teleon* to Zeus Kataibates, and the 12th of Anthesterion (line 33), a kid to Dionysos. Marathon (LS 20 B): the 10th of Elaphebolion (line 17), a goat to Ge. Salaminioi (LSS 19): the 18th of Mounychion (line 87), a pig to Eurysakes; the 7th of Metageitnion (line 88), a pig to Apollon Patroos, and the 6th of Pyanopsion (line 91), a pig to Theseus.

123 Daux 1983, 153–154, lines 28–30, a cow to Thorikos costing between 40 and 50 drachmas, and lines 54–56, a cow to Kephalos costing between 40 and 50 drachmas. The interpretation by Daux 1983, 156 and 169, of the two superimposed Δ between οη and η at the beginning of line 57 as “a sheep costing between 10 and 20 drachmas”, has been questioned by Parker 1987, 147, and van Straten 1995, 177, n. 59, on the grounds that the price is too high for such a victim.

124 Jameson 1965, 155–156; Dow 1968, 180–186; Whitehead 1986a, 176–204. This is particularly obvious in the Erchia calendar, in which the sacrifices are listed in five

parallel columns, each column adding up to more or less the same amount of expenses. The sacrifices in one column were probably paid for by one individual. To find out which rituals took place on a certain day, it was necessary to consult all five columns.

125 Jameson 1965, 156.

126 Dow 1965, 207.

127 Whitehead 1986a, 205–206; Rosivach 1994, 11–12; Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 313–316. See further Parker 1987 on the importance of local sacrifices and festivals for the solidarity of the demes.

128 I see no reason to follow Rosivach (1994, 15), who excludes all piglets from the victims that were eaten, since they were commonly used as purificatory victims and would, in any event, not supply much meat, at least not on these occasions. For the dining on piglets, see Jameson 1988, 98.

129 Rosivach 1994, 84–88; Stengel 1920, 105–106; Berthiaume 1982, 62–69 and 79–80; Isenberg 1975.

130 Cf. Verbanck-Piérard 1998, 115–119.

131 Information on where the sacrifice was to be performed or at which festival has not been taken into consideration here.

132LS 19, 79. Also in lines 19–20, all the sacrifices .rwsī are referred to: θύεν δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσί.

133LS 20 B; cf. also line 23, τάδε ὁ δήμαρχος ὁ Μαραθωνίων θύει.

134 The text follows Daux 1983, 152–154, apart from the following restorations: line 27, Νεανίαι, τέλεον, Πυανοψίς, π [ρατόν] (see Parker 1987, 146); line 36, Ἡρακλείδ[αις τέλεον] (see Parker 1984, 59). Excluded restorations: line 56, unidentified god or hero, perhaps Poseidon (see Daux 1983, 154), Prokris (see Parker 1987, 147) or Pandrosos or Pandora (Scullion 1998, 121); the addition to the left-hand side, at level of line 31, -ωνι, τέλεον ΠΥΑΝΟΨΙΟΙΣ; lines 12 and 52, two unidentified oath-victims. For the interpretation of *teleon* as a full-grown sheep, see above, p. 138, n. 40. For the text, see also the Appendix, pp. 343–345.

135 See Kearns 1989, 177.

136 On the particular role of heroines in the Attic sacrificial calendar, see Larson 1995, 26–34, who argues that heroines were often given less and received less attention than their male counterparts.

137 The text follows LS 20 B, apart from line 20, where - ΝΕΧΟΣ is preferred (see Kearns 1989, 188). Line 10, *spylia* 40 drs, is not known from anywhere else and has been excluded. Line 32, the sheep given to the Tritopatores (no price given) has been counted as costing 12 drs. On the two kinds of sheep, ewes and wethers, see van Straten 1995, 181–184. For the text, see also the Appendix, pp. 345–346.

138 The recipient of two sacrifices among the annual ones cannot be identified. Line B 5 ends with πρὸ μ [υ] στ [η] ρ [ἰων----] and line B 6 reads “one cow/ox 90 drs, one sheep 12 drs. To Kourotrophos ...”. The cow or ox and sheep are likely to have been sacrificed to Demeter, since the Mysteries are concerned and Demeter is

linked with Kourotrophos also in lines B 43–46. The recipient of the cow or ox (90 drs) and the sheep (12 drs) in line B 8 was probably a hero, since the next sacrifice was to a heroine. Furthermore, the victim and the price of the sacrifice to Kourotrophos (line B 6, see above) and Zeus Hypatos (line B 13) have not been preserved.

139 The text follows Daux 1963a, 606–610 = *LS* 18 = *SEG* 21, 1965, 541. The restorations proposed for the missing endings of columns III and V are not included (see Jameson 1965, 156–157, and Dow 1965, 187). On the two kinds of sheep, ewes and wethers, see van Straten 1995, 181–184. For the text, see also the Appendix, pp. 347–351.

140 Col. III, 28; col. IV, 20 and col. V, 12; col. IV, 53. For Menedeios, perhaps related to the cult of Bendis, see Jameson, 1965, 158–159.

141 Col. III, 50; for Leukaspis at Syracuse, see Dunst 1964, 482–485. This cult will be further discussed in ch. III, pp. 259–261.

142 Dow 1965, 210–211; Dow 1968, 182–183.

143 Dow 1965, 192–193; Dow 1968, 183.

144 Daux 1963a, 632–633; Jameson 1965, 155; Whitehead 1986b, 62.

145 Daux 1963a, 632; Mikalson 1977, 427–428.

146 On the contents of the presumed “Lesser Demarchia”, see Whitehead 1986b, 60–61.

147 The text is completely preserved; see *LSS* 19 (*N.B.* I follow Sokolowski’s numbering of the lines which differs from Ferguson’s after line 67); Ferguson 1938, 3–5; new edition by Lambert S. 1997, 86–88, correcting the price for wood in line 91 to 3.5 drachmas. One sacrifice is listed as being biennial (line 87, a sheep to Ion). No price is given for this victim, but, if all the costs listed in the calendar have been deducted from the total of 530.5 drs (summarized in line 94), there remain 11 drs, which in two years would have added up to 22 drs, more than enough to buy a sheep costing 15 drs, as well as wood; for discussion, see Ferguson 1938, 64–65; Lambert S. 1997, 93. On the two kinds of sheep, ewes and wethers, see van Straten 1995, 181–184. For the text, see also the Appendix, pp. 352–355.

148 Lines 20–24 and 86; cf. Ferguson 1938, 33–34 and 67.

149 Lines 11, 34 and 83–84; Ferguson 1938, 16.

150 Ferguson 1938, 28 and 67.

151 The different occasions when the Salaminioi sacrificed, either to a group of gods and heroes or to a singular god or hero, are separated from each other by the phrase covering the funds for wood and other expenses (lines 86, 87, 88, 89, 91 and 92) and/or the indication of the date when the sacrifice was to be performed (lines 87, 88 and 91); see Ferguson 1938, 22; Parker 1996, 313–316.

152 Lines 52–54; for the salt-works, see Ferguson 1938, 54–55; Thompson 1938, 75–76; Young J.H. 1941, 179–182.

153 Cf. van Straten 1995, 170–181. On the relation between deme and state sacrifices, see Mikalson 1977; Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 313–316.

154 The beginning of the Thorikos calendar is lost and may have contained such terminology.

155 On the amount of meat from different victims, see Rosivach 1994, 157–158, who also outlines the difficulties of calculating how far this meat went.

156 Jameson 1988, 94–95, some of these animals may have been bought from outside Attica.

157 Not all demes could have had an eponymous hero, since they were not eponymously named, and may have had an *archegetes* instead (see Whitehead 1986a, 208–211). A *Heros archegetes*, who also had a statue, is known from Rhamnous (see Pouilloux 1954a, no. 26; Petrakos 1991, 43, no. 16).

158 Jameson 1988, 87–119, esp. 95 and 106.

159 Rudhardt 1958, 286–287. The terms are commonly found in Hebrew and Christian contexts.

160 See above, pp. 82–86.

161 Hdt. 1.167.

162 Ath. pol. 58.1.

163 Demosthenes (*De falsa leg.* 280) says that Harmodios and Aristogeiton received a share in the libations at sacrifices in every shrine and that they were honoured as equals to the gods and the heroes. They also had statues in the agora, a unique honour; see Wycherley 1957, 93–98; cf. Parker 1996, 136, with n. 55.

164 Mir. ausc. 840a.

165 Hdt. 2.44.

166 See further below, pp. 219–221.

167 Pp. 183–192; cf. Ekroth 2000.

168 Pind. *Ol.* 1.90–91. For the full text and discussion of this passage, see pp. 190–192.

169 Gerber 1982, 141–142; Casabona 1966, 206; Krummen 1990, 159. The etymology is usually given as deriving from *μόρος* (fill); see Chantraine 1968–80, s.v. *αἶμα* 2; cf. Slater 1989, 493, n. 39.

170 Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.5 (see above, p. 102); Hsch. s.v. (Latte 1953–66, A 1939); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. (Gaisford 1848). See also schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.146a and 1.146d (Drachmann 1903–27).

171 Thuc. 5.11. For the full text and discussion of this passage, see pp. 184–185.

172 Casabona 1966, 128 and 226–229, who equates the term with *haimakouria*; Rudhardt 1958, 285; Stengel 1910, 103–104; Hornblower 1996, 451–452.

173 Fr. 65, lines 77–94 (Austin 1968); see also Cropp 1995 for commentary and translation; cf. Jouan 2000.

174 Fr. 65, lines 77–80 (Austin 1968). For the full text and discussion of this passage, see pp. 186–188.

175 Casabona 1966, 174–178.

176 Casabona 1966, 189 and 336–337. On *sphagia*, see also Jameson 1991.

177 See Cropp 1995, 192, line 79, who compares *bouktonos* to *tauroktonos*, “bull-

slaying” (Soph. *Phil.* 400). Cf. Eur. *IT.* 384: θυσίαις βροτοκτόνοις; Eur. *Cret.* fr. 82, line 37 (Austin 1968): σφαγὰς ἀνδροκτόνους, “cut-throat murders”. Cf. Robertson 1996, 45, translating *sphagai bouktonoi* as “a bloodletting of slain oxen”.

178 Fr. 65, lines 81–86 (Austin 1968). For the full text and discussion of this passage, see pp. 186–188.

179 Austin 1967, 57, line 83; Kron 1976, 196; Henrichs 1983, 98; Scullion 1994, 117; Cropp 1995, 173 and 192; Connelly 1996, 58; Jouan 2000, 34. Mikalson 1991, 32, gives the meaning “first fruits of battle”.

180 Cropp 1995, 192, line 83, with references to Wilkins 1993, 101–102, lines 399–409.

181 Jameson 1991, 205.

182 On the distinction between camp-ground and battle-line sacrifices, see Jameson 1991, 205–209.

183 *LSJ* s.v.

184 See Casabona 1966, 227–229; *entoma* is also very rare and is attested only twice in sacrificial contexts in the Archaic-Classical sources (Hdt. 2.119 and 7.191), both cases concerning sacrifices of blood in order to procure favourable winds.

185 *LSJ* s.v. Cf. τόμος (slice, piece). Cf. also the *rhyta* consisting of an animal’s head or *protome* with a funnel attached to it. These vessels have been suggested to be particularly connected with heroes and hero-cults, see Hoffmann 1997, 8–15.

186 Cf. Aesch. *Psych.* no. 125, col. II, lines 3–4 (Kramer al. 1980, 17): ὑπὸ τ' αὐχένιον λαιμόν ἀμήσω τοῦδε σφαγίου (when you have cut off the throat of this sacrificial victim at the neck); parodied in Ar. *Av.* 1559–1560. A scholiast on Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.587 (Wendel 1935) states that at sacrifices to the dead and the chthonians, the victims are decapitated facing the ground, διὰ τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν ἀποτέμεσθαι, τὰς κεφαλὰς. Decapitation of the sacrificial victims before a battle may also be referred to in Plut. *Vit. Pyrrh.* 31. Pyrrhos’ and Antigonos’ armies are ready to clash near Argos when Pyrrhos has a bad omen: the heads of the sacrificed oxen, which were already lying apart (from the bodies), were seen to put forward their tongues and lick their own blood (τῶν γὰρ βοῶν τεθυμένων αἱ κεφαλαὶ κείμεναι χωρὶς ἤδη τὰς τε γλώττας ὥφθησαν προβάλλουσι καὶ περιλιχμῶμεναι, τὸν ἑαυτῶν φόνον). Cf. the Roman Octoberhorse, which was decapitated and also had a connection with war, see Latte 1960, 119–121; Beard, North & Price 1998, 47–48 with n. 144.

187 *Od.* 11.35. Hughes (1991, 52 and 219–220, n. 14) prefers the translation “cut the throat of” rather than “behead”, even though he admits that decapitation might well be a consequence. In the *Theogony* (line 280), *apodeirotomein* means behead, since the direct object of the action is the head of Medusa. For other instances of *apodeirotomein* with the same meaning but not in a religious context, see *LSJ* s.v.

188 Paris, Cabinet des Médailles 422, c. 400–375 BC; Furtwängler & Reichhold 1900, vol. 1, 300–302, pl. 60:1; Trendall 1938, pl. 16; *LIMC* VIII, 1997, s.v. Teiresias, no. 11.

189 Fr. 65, lines 90–94 (Austin 1968). For the full text and discussion of this passage,

see pp. 188–189.

190 Casabona 1966, 140–142. For the ironical use, see Ar. Av. 1231–1233.

191 See *LSJ* s.v. for references; cf. Vernant 1991, 294.

192 Cropp 1995, 193, lines 93–94, gives the translation “ox-sacrificing slaughters”.

193 Pind. *Ol.* 1.93; Thuc. 5.11; *LSS* 64, 1–4; Eur. *Erech.* fr. 65, line 68 (Austin 1968).

194 Eur. *Erech.* fr. 65, lines 59–60 (Austin 1968).

195 Cf. Casabona 1966, 226. Paus. 5.13.2 speaks of Herakles sacrificing (*thyein*) into a *bothros* at the installation of the cult of Pelops at Olympia. Cf. above, pp. 67–68.

196 Ekroth 2000, 274–276, fig. 1. A small hole with unknown purpose, cut in the paving near the foot of the back wall of the portico, may also have been used for the discarding of the blood, see Ekroth 2000, 276, fig. 2; Paton 1927, 109–110, figs. 66 A–B:e and 67 A–B:e. Robertson (1996, 32) suggests that blood or bile may have been meant to run into these cavities in the rock. For the cult of Erechtheus in the northern portico of the Erechtheion and the altar, see also Paton 1927, 104–110, figs. 66 A–C and 67 A–B; cf. Kron 1976, 43–47; *IG* 13 474, 77–80 and 202–208. On the identification of the Erechtheion, see Hurwit 1999, 200–209, esp. 202; Jeppesen (1987, *passim*) suggests the “House of the Arrephoroi” to be the Erechtheion, while Robertson (1996, 37–44) proposes the so-called “Pandion”.

197 *Cyr.* 8.3.24.

198 Casabona 1966, 164, considers the sacrifices as barbarian customs viewed by Greek eyes.

199 *Pyth.* 5.85–86. There has been some disagreement concerning who received whom in this passage. Perret (1942, 182–212) and Brunel (1964, 5–21) both suggested that the Antenoridai received Battos upon his arrival. Most scholars concerned with the matter support the more plausible interpretation that it is the Antenoridai who are welcomed, see Malkin 1994, 52–56 and 64–66; Krummen 1990, 117–130; Defradas 1952, 282–301.

200 Recurrent cult: Farnell 1932, 179–180; Defradas 1952, 292–300; Vian 1955, 307–309; Krummen 1990, 120; Malkin 1994, 55–56 and 64–66. Single occurrence: Chamoux 1949, 155–161; cf. Malkin 1987, 153; Brunel 1964, 7–12.

201 Malkin 1994, 55–56; Krummen 1990, 120–124; Defradas 1952, 289–301, who identifies the Antenoridai with the Dioskouroi/Akamantes on the basis of the *theoxenia* ritual. Vian (1955, 308) also stresses the connection with the *Karneia* but considers the *theoxenia* as a kind of funerary cult to the Antenoridai.

202 For topographical suggestions on where the cult of the Antenoridai was performed, see Malkin 1994, 53–56; Krummen 1990, 126.

203 Pind. *Ol.* 1.90–92. Translation by Race 1997. For the full text and discussion of this passage, see pp. 190–192.

204 Gerber 1982, 143–144; Slater 1989, 491; Krummen 1990, 164–165.

205 Gerber 1982, 142.

206 Gerber 1982, 142, who also points to the contrast between Tantalos (lines 58–59), having no share in the banquet, being deprived of fellowship and having a life

of continuous toil, and Pelops (line 93), participating in the blood-offerings and enjoying the fellowship of man.

207 See below, pp. 190–192.

208 Heropythos *FGrHist* 448 F 1; Philostephanos *FHG* III, 29, F 1; cf. Malkin 1987, 197. On *τάριχος* as a regular kind of food served, for example, at the Eileithyiaia on Delos, see Linders 1994, 78.

209 Malkin 1987, 200, assumes consumption. Apollonides of Smyrna (early 1st century AD), *Anth. Pal.* 6.105, wrote an epigram on a fisherman sacrificing a grilled red mullet, a hake and a cup of wine with bread broken into it. This sounds like a *theoxenia* ritual. There is epigraphical evidence for fish being burnt as a complement to the hero's portion at a *thysia* (Foundation of Diomedon, *LS* 177, line 63, c. 300 BC; Testament of Epikteta, c. 250–200 BC, Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 43, line 191 = *LS* 135), but that does not seem to have been the case in the cult of Kylabras.

210 Thuc. 3.58: ἐσθήμασι, τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις νομίμοις, ὅσα τε ἡ γῆ ἡμῶν ἀνεδίδου ὠραῖα, πάντων ἀπαρχὰς ἐπιφέροντες

211 Beer 1914, 8–49; Rudhardt 1958, 219–222; Burkert 1985, 66–68; Jameson 1994a, 38–39. *Aparchai* is usually the ritual which initiates a sacrifice.

212 A similar ritual is mentioned in the laws of Drakon, as quoted by Porphyrios, *Abst.* 4.22.7: θεοὺς τιμᾶν καὶ ἥρωας ἐγχωρίους ... σὺν εὐφημίᾳ καὶ ἀπαρχαῖς καρπῶν <καὶ> πελάνοις ἐπετείοις (Patillon & Segonds 1995). This passage is often referred to as one of the earliest mentions of sacrifices in hero-cult. The law is probably not an authentic Draconian law, however, but rather of Hellenistic date; see Busolt & Swoboda 1926, 814, n. 2.

213 Unlike the inscriptions, the literary sources occasionally mention libations to heroes performed as independent rituals and not in connection with animal sacrifice: the Persian magi ἐχέαντο χοὰς ... τοῖσι ἥρωσι at Troy (Hdt. 7.43); Harmodios and Aristogeiton being made partners ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις σπονδῶν καὶ κρατήρων κοινωνοὺς (Dem. *De falsa leg.* 280); the second cup of mixed wine (κραῖσις) at a meal offered to the heroes (Aesch. *Epig.* fr. 55 [Nauck 1889]); *bomoi*, *spondai* and *heroa* given to three of the companions of Demetrios Poliorketes (Demochares *FGrHist* 75 F 1). The traditional linking of *chein* and *choe* with the gods of the underworld, heroes and the dead, and *spendein* and *sponde* with the heavenly gods, has been shown to be too stereotyped; see Casabona 1966, 293–296; Rudhardt 1958, 240–248.

214 *Mir. ausc.* 840a. See above, p. 85.

215 The prohibition for women to eat of these animals is surely to be connected with the fact that Agamemnon was slain by a woman, his wife Klytaimnestra. Women were excluded also from the cults of some other “misogynist” divinities who had had bad experiences of women, for example, Herakles (*IG* XII Suppl. 414, 3–4; see Bergquist 1973, 73, n. 190, for further references) and Orpheus (Konon *FGrHist* 26 F 1, 45.6). For the barring of women from cult, see also Wächter 1910, 125–130.

216 See discussion above, p. 85 and pp. 127–128.

217 *Isthm.* 4.61–68.

218 Translation by Race 1997.

219 Slater 1969, s.v. δαίς; Schmitt-Pantel 1990, 22. Krummen 1990, 56, also recognizes a *theoxenia* element.

220 Fresh garlands: Thummer 1968, 175, line 80. Newly built altars: Bury 1892, 76, line 62; Slater 1969, s.v. νεόδμητος. Schachter 1986, 26, n. 1, finds either interpretation possible. Cf. Krummen 1990, 41–48, suggesting the altars being new but also garlanded, the latter action being a reference to funerary cult.

221 On the meaning of *auxomen empyra*, “make great the sacrifice of burnt offerings”, see Slater 1969, s.v. αὐξάνω. Krummen (1990, 43, 54–55 and 62–69) understands *auxomen* as containing both a reference to honour and to cult, and argues for a connection between *empyra* and *pyrai* (funeral pyres), since, according to the literary tradition, Herakles killed his sons by throwing them into the fire. The connection between *dais* and *bomos* is made also in *Ol.* 9.112 (see below).

222 Burkert (1985, 63) takes this ritual to be a parallel to the fire festivals of Herakles on Mount Oite. Sacrifices to heroes have often been considered as taking place at night; see Stengel 1910, 133; Stengel 1920, 143; Rohde 1925, 116 and 140, n. 7. In most cases, however, there is no information about the time of day when the sacrifice is performed.

223 Either to Herakles or to the sons, see Schachter 1986, 26; Krummen 1990, 75–94.

224 Pind. *Ol.* 9.112.

225 For the meaning of *dais*, see Slater 1969, s.v. δαίς; Schmitt-Pantel 1990, 22

226 Hdt. 5.67.

227 On the relation between *thysia* and *heorte*, see Casabona 1966, 132–134 and 336.

228 See Mikalson 1982, 213–221, on the meaning and contents of *heorte*.

229 Miller 1978, 4–13.

230 *Nem.* 7.46–47.

231 The term *polythytos* does not seem to occur outside poetry, see Casabona 1966, 144; Bury 1890, 135; cf. Slater 1969, s.v. Suárez de la Torre (1997, 155–156) suggests that the heroes mentioned constitute a reference to Neoptolemos, either alone or in connection with other heroes.

232 On the relation between sacrifice and *pompe*, see Burkert 1985, 56 and 99–102; Graf 1996, 56–65. The intimate link between *pompe* and *thysia* is clear also from the iconographical material (see Peirce 1993, 229). The scholion on the Pindar passage (Drachmann 1903–27, *Nem.* 7.68a) states that there were *xenia* for heroes at Delphi, to which Apollon called the heroes to come and participate.

233 See above, pp. 171–179; cf. Ekroth 2000.

234 5.11. On the particular role of Brasidas in Thucydides, see Hornblower 1996, 38–61.

235 Translation by Hornblower 1996, 449–455.

236 On the interpretation of the *Hagnoneia* as cult buildings, see Hornblower 1996, 452–455; cf. Malkin 1987, 231–232.

237 The addition ὥς ἥρω will be discussed below (pp. 206–212), since it is used also with other terms. There seems to be no support for Gomme’s interpretation (1956b, 654–655) that Brasidas was worshipped as a god or received annual festivals at which sacrifices to the gods took place (see Malkin 1987, 228–232; Hornblower 1996, 452).

238 Malkin 1987, 228–230.

239 Malkin 1987, 230. The present tense, ἐντέμνουσι, has also been suggested as indicating an eye-witness account, presumably by Thucydides himself (see Hornblower 1996, 452).

240 Cf. Casabona 1966, 128 and 226. For the conjectural identification of “Brasidas” tomb under the museum at Amphipolis, see Hornblower 1996, 451.

241 Brasidas was not the actual founder of Amphipolis, but he took over the role of oikist from Hagnon who had founded the city in 437 BC (see Malkin 1987, 81 and 229–230).

242 Malkin 1987, 203. Malkin (193) further defines the cult of the oikist as a hero-cult but does not specify which kind of sacrifice that would imply, even though he seems to favour a ritual with dining.

243 Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1134b; cf. Malkin 1987, 229. A third source mentioning the cult of Brasidas at Amphipolis is the mid-2nd-century AD Aelius Aristides, who describes the cult as Βρασίδα θύειν ... ὥς ἥρω καὶ οἰμιστῇ (*Alex. epitaph.* 85).

244 Fr. 65, lines 77–89 (Austin 1968); see also Cropp 1995 for commentary and translation.

245 Translation by Cropp 1995, 173.

246 For possible reconstructions of lines 81–82, see Cropp 1995, 173 and commentary, 192.

247 Lines 87–89.

248 Cf. Henrichs 1983, 98.

249 Cf. Mikalson 1991, 33–34; Casabona 1966, 176.

250 Robertson 1996, 45–46, suggests that the ritual was similar to the sacrifices performed on the battlefield.

251 *Thyein* covers the ritual opposite to pouring out a libation and never seems to refer only to a drink-offering (see Casabona 1966, 75–76). For the firewood, see Cropp 1995, 192, lines 84–86. For *pyra* meaning an altar, see Denniston 1939, 112, line 513.

252 Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 12 (ap. schol. Soph. OC 100 [Papageorgius 1888]); cf. Kearns 1989, 60–61, n. 70.

253 The Hyakinthids were buried where one of them was sacrificed and the rest killed themselves (Eur. *Erech.* fr. 65, lines 67–70). Henrichs 1983, 98, with n. 54, believes that there was a grave separate from the cult-place, as well as separate locations for the sacrifices. Cropp 1995, 191, lines 67–68, and Larson 1995, 153 and 187, n. 98, locate the cult at the tomb. Treu 1971, 121–122, places both the burial and the cult place outside the city. Jouan 2000, 34, n. 30, suggests Euripides

combined the rituals for the Hyakinthids with those of the Panathenaia, which ended with a hecatomb.

254 Fr. 65, lines 90–94 (Austin 1968); Cropp 1995, 174–175 and 193.

255 Translation by Cropp 1995, 175.

256 On the complex question of the merging of Erechtheus and Poseidon in the cult, see, for example, Kron 1976, 48–52; Kearns 1989, 210–211; Christopoulos 1994, 123–130; Cropp 1995, 193, lines 93–94.

257 Cf. Harmodios of Lepreum (FGrHist 319 F 1), who speaks of the *bouthysia megale* to the heroes at Phigaleia, a sacrifice followed by a banquet in which the slaves could participate and the boys dined with their fathers.

258 See above, p. 176, n. 196. See also Stern (1986, 57–58), who suggests that the northern portico of the Erechtheion resembles the set of a theatre. The construction of the Erechtheion definitely seems to have begun when Euripides wrote the *Erechtheus*, probably in 424 BC, see Treu 1971, 125–126.

259 Sacrifices to Erechtheus are mentioned in the *Iliad* (2.550–551) as ταύρῳθισι, καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἱλάονται κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων (the young men of the Athenians propitiate him with bulls and rams); on the authenticity of this passage, see Kirk 1985, 179–180 and 208–209. Is the propitiation to be taken as a reference to a blood ritual?

260 For the link Erechtheus-Panathenaia, see Mikalson 1976, 153; Connelly 1996, 77–78. For Erechtheus receiving his sacrifices at the Skira, see Robertson 1985, 235 with n. 6; Robertson 1996, 45.

261 *l.* 1.90–93.

262 Translation by Race 1997.

263 The other major piece of evidence for sacrifices to Pelops is Paus. 5.13.1–3. On the importance of Pelops at Olympia, see Burkert 1983, 93–103. For the archaeological remains of the Pelopion, see, for the older excavations, Furtwängler 1890, 2–3; Dörpfeld 1892, 57; Dörpfeld 1935, 118–124; Mallwitz 1972, 133–137; Herrmann H. 1980, 62–73. The new investigations of the Pelopion have lowered the date of the introduction of the cult to the Archaic period; see Mallwitz 1988, 79–109; Kyrieleis 1990, 181–188; Kyrieleis 1992, 20–24; cf. Antonaccio 1995a, 170–176.

264 Gerber 1982, 141.

265 See pp. 171–172 and p. 178.

266 Gerber 1982, 142.

267 For example, Burkert 1983, 96; Slater 1969, s.v. βωμόν; Race 1997, 56, n. 1. No traces of this altar have been found (see Mallwitz 1972, 84). Slater 1989, 491, is more hesitant in his identification of the altar and says that it is “presumably that of Zeus”.

268 Gerber 1982, 145, followed by Krummen 1990, 159–160.

269 Gerber 1982, 144. Krummen (1990, 163–164) is more in favour of the *amphipoloi* providing for Pelops himself than for any visitors.

270 Gerber 1982, 145. The scholia on this passage either identify the altar as that of

Pelops (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.150a [Drachmann 1903–1927]) or as belonging to Zeus and Pelops (schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.150b [Drachmann 1903–1927]).

271 Pausanias (5.13.2), the only other source to comment upon the details of the sacrifices to Pelops, does not mention a *haimakouria* or any other blood ritual being executed in his time, but he states that the cult of Pelops was initiated by Herakles, who performed a *thysia* in a *bothros*, a sacrifice which may be taken as a reference to a blood ritual (see above, p. 70).

272 Pausanias (5.13.2) also describes a ritual including dining: the neck of the sacrificial victim was given to the woodman and anyone eating of the meat of the victim was barred from entering the temple of Zeus, cf. Burkert 1983, 101; Slater 1989, 494; Ekroth 1999, 154.

273 Slater 1989, 495–501; Burkert 1983, 100–102; cf. Uhsadel-Gülke 1972, 31–33; Krummen 1990, 168–184.

274 Earlier in the ode (*Ol.* 1.46–53), Pindar refutes as slander the myth of Pelops being boiled. Cf. Slater’s discussion of *Ol.* 1.48–49 as referring to the public sacrifice and boiling of the black ram (Slater 1989, 498).

275 Hdt. 1.59. On the recovery of cauldrons and tripods from the excavations at Olympia, see Burkert 1983, 101 and n. 39.

276 *Resp.* 427b.

277 *Resp.* 427b τελευτησάντων τε αὖ θῆμαι καὶ ὅσα τοῖς ἐκεί δεῖ ὑπηρετοῦντας ἴλεως αὐτοῦς ἔχειν.

278 Plato’s three categories of gods, *daimones* and heroes occur also in *Resp.* 392a and *Leg.* 818c, cf. also Motte 2000, 79–90; Ramos Jurado 2000, 101–103. The meaning of the term *daimon* shows substantial variations, depending on the source where it is found and its date (see Nowak 1960 for the general development of the term from Homeric to Christian times) but does in general not refer to a recipient of cult, apart from the *Agathos daimon*; see Mikalson 1983, 64–66. On the Platonic meaning of *daimon*, see Burkert 1985, 331–332; Reverdin 1945, 127–139; Motte 2000, 79–90. For the use of *daimon* in 5th-century tragedy, where it refers to (usually bad) “fortune” and is never a cult deity, see Mikalson 1991, 22–29.

279 Cf. Casabona 1966, 128.

280 *Leg.* 717a–b.

281 *Mund.* 400b.

282 *Mund.* 400b θεῶν τε θυσίαι καὶ ἥρώων θεραπείαι καὶ χοαὶ κειμηλιότων..

283 *De cor.* 184.

284 Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 10.

285 Xen. *Cyr.* 3.3.22 θεοὺς θυσίας καὶ ἥρωας Ἀσσυρίας οἰκήτορας ἡυμένιζετο.

286 Xen. *Cyr.* 3.3.21–22.

287 This is a non-Greek sacrifice described in Greek terms, but rituals performed at a border crossing on land seem not to have included any kind of particular action different from a regular sacrifice, as opposed to the crossing of rivers and the sea, at which the sacrifices seem to have been *sphagia*, see Jameson 1991, 202–203.

288Contr. Macart. 66; Fontenrose 1978, 253–254, H29, dated to before 340 BC.

289*Apopempein* may be used in the sense “to send away”, for example a *pharmakos*, but the meaning “to send offerings” without any negative connotations is also common from Homer and onwards, see Schlesier 1990, 38–41.

290 This concerns in particular the *daimones*, see above, p. 193, n. 278. Still, it is interesting to note the complete lack in Plato of the terms usually considered as characteristic for hero-cults, such as *enagizein*, *eschara* and *heroon*, see Motte 2000, 88.

291 Perry 1952, no. 110 = Hausrath 1962, no. 112. For other cases of *heroa* near houses, see Rusten 1983, 292–295.

292 See van Straten 1995, 179.

293*Isthm.* 5.30–31.

294 Slater 1969, s.v.

295 Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 25.

296 Ephoros *FGrHist* 70 F 118.

297 Pl. *Menex.* 244a.

298 Pl. *Menex.* 249b.

299 Dem. *Epitaph.* 36.

300 See above, p. 76, n. 248.

301*Enagizein*: 1.167; 2.44. *Thyein/thysia*: 5.47 (twice); 5.67; 5.114; 6.38; 7.117. *Choai*: 7.43. For hero-sacrifices described by *timan/timai* (1.168; 4.33; 4.35 [twice]), see below.

302 Hdt. 5.47.

303 On the cult of enemies, see Visser 1982. Fontenrose (1968) classifies the athletes worshipped as heroes as belonging to the “avenging-hero” type, i.e., the wronged hero whose anger is placated by cult. On athletes as heroes, see further Bohringer 1979, who argues that these kinds of cults arose in particular when the city, which later worshipped the hero, experienced difficulties.

304 Herodotos uses *hilaskesthai* and *exhilaskesthai* also for sacrifices to various gods (Apollon, Pan, Zeus, the winds) and to inanimate objects (the gold of the Skythians), as well as metaphorically (see Powell J. 1966, s.v. for references).

305 Hdt. 5.112–113.

306 Hdt. 5.114.

307 Hdt. 7.117.

308 The term *Çtumboqóee* is to be taken as referring to the piling up of the grave mound rather than as a reference to *choai*, see Powell J. 1966, s.v. *tumboqóew*; Casabona 1966, 84–85. Furthermore, the whole army participated, an involvement which is unlikely, had the action consisted in the pouring of libations.

309 Hdt. 6.38. For the historical background, see Malkin 1987, 77–78 and 190–193.

310 Malkin 1987, 190–191 and 200.

311 The honouring of heroes seems to be a particular feature of the literary sources, rarely documented in the inscriptions from the period under study here.

The only comparable, epigraphical case concerns the hero Naulochos of Priene, who was honoured (ἥρωα τόνδε σέβειν) as a guardian of the city and had a sanctuary; see Hiller von Gaertringen 1906, no. 196, c. 350 BC; cf. *LS* 180, 15 (c. 250 BC), an oracle approving a cult of Archilochos on Paros, ([τι] μῶντι Ἀρχίλοχον).

312 The terminology of honours is not commented upon in particular by Stengel (1910 and 1920), Nilsson (1967), Burkert (1985), Rudhardt (1958) or Casabona (1966).

313 In Homer, *time* is reserved solely for the living and has no connection with religious observances (see Nagy 1979, 149–150; McGlew 1989, 286–287 with nn. 7 and 8). Hesiod uses *time* as referring both to the actual sacrifice, in particular to the god's portion, and to the religious attention, the honour, given to the divinity (see *Theog.* 73–74, 112–113 and 881–885, discussed by Rudhardt 1970). On *time* in Hesiod and the distinction from its usage by Homer, see Nagy 1979, 151–155. For the development of the meaning of *thyein*, see Casabona 1966, 69–85.

314 Nagy 1979, 118–119; Mikalson 1991, 183–202.

315 Mikalson 1991, 183–202; see also Mikalson 1998, 301–303.

316 Cf. the components of *time* among the Greeks as defined by Aristotle (*Rh.* 1361a): sacrifices, memorials in verse and prose, privileges, grants of land, front seats, public burial, statues and maintenance by the state (μέρη δὲ τιμῆς θυσίαι, μνημαὶ ἐν μέτροις καὶ ἄνευ μέτρων, γέρα, τεμένη, προεδρίαί, τάφοι, εἰκόνες, τροφαὶ δημόσια).

317 Hdt. 4.33–35.

318 Hdt. 4.33.

319 Hdt. 4.35.

320 Hdt. 4.34. The *sema* has usually been identified with a semi-circular foundation in the Artemision, cut out of the poros bedrock and covered with a stone packing. The monument, probably of Late Bronze Age date, was fenced in by a wall in the Hellenistic period. See *Guide de Délos*³ 1983, no. 41; Picard & Replat 1924, 247–263; Picard 1946, 56, with fig. 1, for the Hellenistic enclosure; Gallet de Santerre 1958, 32–33 and 94–95; Vatin 1965, 225–230; Roux 1973, 528; Schallin 1993, 102–104. Among the finds in this structure were pottery dating from the Mycenaean to the Archaic periods, fragments of a bronze lebes, spindle whorls and ashes.

321 Hdt. 4.35.

322 The location of the *theke* is more disputed. The remains of a built-up, Bronze Age tomb, surrounded by a semi-circular wall in the Hellenistic period and situated on the southern side of the portico of Antigonos, is the most frequently suggested candidate (see *Guide de Délos*³ 1983, no. 32; Courby 1912, 63–74; Gallet de Santerre 1958, 32–35 and 93–94; Vatin 1965, 225–230; Schallin 1993, 102–103). Roux 1973, 525–534 and 543–544, argues for a different location further to the west, north of the temple of Artemis (*Guide de Délos*³ 1983, no. 46) and east of the building no. 48 (*Guide de Délos*³ 1983), which he identifies as the *hestiatorion* of the Keans.

323 Some scholars have argued that there was originally only one cult of the Hyperborean maidens which was later doubled (see the discussion in Larson 1995,

119–121). Whatever the origin of the cult, Herodotos describes two sets of honours or sacrifices.

324 Offerings of hair were among the *timai megistai* promised to Hippolytos by Artemis (see Eur. *Hipp.* 1423–1427; cf. Mikalson 1991, 41–42 and 186).

325 On this particular ritual, see Robertson 1983, 143–169; Burkert 1985, 101–102.

326 Artemis: Pfister 1909–12, 452; Nilsson 1906, 207; Sale 1961, 78; Robertson 1983, 147; Larson 1995, 119. One suspects that Pfister excluded the possibility of the *bomos* belonging to the Hyperborean maidens, since he was convinced that the altar used in a hero-cult was either an *eschara* or a *bothros* (*ibid.* 474–476). Apollon: *Guide de Délos* 1983, 145, n. 1.

327 Roux 1973, 525–526 with n. 2, identifies the altar as belonging to Opis and Arge. Chantraine & Masson (1954, 99) and Casabona (1966, 202–203) interpret the ritual as a sacrifice offered to Opis and Arge following the traditional Greek rituals, i.e., a regular *thysia*. Casabona further emphasizes that there is no particular chthonian connection of the term *kathagizein* in Herodotos.

328 The spreading of the ashes in a particular place, and especially a holy one, such as the *theke*, was not a common action. Unless the ashes were left where the burning had taken place and allowed to form an ash-altar, they were considered as waste that had to be disposed of. Negligence to clear away ashes could even be punished with a fine; see Németh 1994, 62–63, who has shown that in many cases *spodos* was treated in the same way as *kopros*, the dung or excrement of animals produced during sacrifice.

329 Thuc. 3.58.

330 Cf. the fragmentary laws of Drakon which state that the gods and heroes of the country should be honoured annually in public with prayer and *aparchai* consisting of fruits and cakes (Θέους τιμᾶν καὶ ἥρωας ἐγχώριους ἐν κοινῷ ... σὺν εὐφημίῃ καὶ ἀπαρχαῖς καρπῶν <καὶ> πελάνοις ἐπετείου; Porph. *Abst.* 4.22.7; Patillon & Segonds 1995). For the date of this law, probably Hellenistic, see Busolt & Swoboda 1926, 814, n. 2.

331 Burning of clothes: Hdt. 5.92; cf. the clothes mentioned in the 5th-century BC funerary law from Ioulis, Keos, *LS* 97 A, 2–3 = *IG* XII:5 593. Gomme (1956a) suggests that the clothes mentioned by Thucydides were either offerings of clothes to the dead or the special clothes worn by the Plataian archon at the festival at the tombs, as narrated by Plutarch (*Vit. Arist.* 21.4). Dedications of clothes are mainly known from sanctuaries of Artemis (see van Straten 1995, 82–83 and Linders 1972 for the inventories from Brauron in which the clothes are mentioned). For the dedication of clothes as spoils of war, see Aesch. *Sept.* 275–279, with commentary by Hutchinson 1985, 87–88.

332 Fr. 65, lines 79–80 (Austin 1968).

333 Thuc. 5.11; cf. Hornblower 1996, 455.

334 Hornblower 1996, 455; Malkin 1987, 231–232.

335 The *entemnein* sacrifices to Brasidas were not necessarily part of the cult of

Hagnon, since these rituals seem to have been linked in particular to the fact that Brasidas was killed in war (see the discussion below, pp. 257–259). Hagnon, on the other hand, was still alive when he was accorded the *timai*, see Hornblower 1996, 452–454; Malkin 1987, 231.

336 Malkin 1987, 200 and 203.

337 Hdt. 1.168. See Malkin 1987, 221–223, on the status of this cult as that of an oikist.

338 Pind. *Pyth.* 5.95. See further Malkin 1987, 204–206, with a discussion of the sacred law from Kyrene in connection with Battos. On the sacrifices to the mythical founders of Kyrene, the Antenoridai, see above, p. 177.

339 Xen. *Hell.* 7.3.12.

340 The term *archegetes* was commonly applied to oikists, for example, to Battos, and could serve as a cult title (see Malkin 1987, 241–250).

341 See above, p. 76, n. 248.

342 Thuc. 3.58.

343 Thuc. 2.35.

344 Lys. *Epitaph.* 80.

345 Pl. *Menex.* 249b. In *Menex.* 244a, Plato speaks of *thysiai*.

346 Dem. *Epitaph.* 36. Cf. Loraux 1986, 38, on the distinction between the burial of the war dead, which ensured them eternal remembrance, and the annual sacrifices and games, which reactivated the initial honours.

347 Dem. *Epitaph.* 36; cf. Pl. *Menex.* 244a.

348 Hyp. *Epitaph.* 21.

349 Habicht 1970, 28–36; Parker 1996, 257–258.

350 Price 1984a, 33–34, considers that the classification of the recipient as a hero was a means of degrading his status.

351 Cf. Habicht 1970, 31–32.

352 The relationship between Demetrios Poliorketes, considered as a god or equal to a god, and three of his companions, who were given *bomoi*, *heroa* and *spondai*, is perhaps a better example of the use of a hero-cult as marking an inferior status (Demochares *FGrHist* 75 F 1; cf. Habicht 1970, 44–58; Price 1984a, 33–34; Parker 1996, 259; Mikalson 1998, 88). It may be of importance that Demetrios and his companions were still alive when these cults were instituted.

353 Isoc. *Plat.* 60. Probably these heroes were not the war-dead buried at Plataiai (see Schachter 1986, 55–56).

354 Alkman, no. 7, fr. 1, lines 6–9 (Page 1962).

355 Pind. *Isthm.* 5.32–33.

356 Arist. *Rh.* 1398b; Alkidamas no. 14 (Radermacher 1951, 134).

357 *Mir. ausc.* 840a; cf. Harrison 1989, 174.

358 Eur. *Antiope* fr. 48, line 99 (Kambitsis 1972, with commentary pp. 124–125); Jouan 2000, 36, esp. n. 41. Eur. *Hipp.* I, fr. 446 (Hallerau 1995 = Nauck 1889, fr. 446); cf. Mikalson 1991, 41–42. In the second version of the *Hippolytos*, the hero is

promised *timai megistai* and offerings of hair (Eur. *Hipp.* 1423–1427).

359 Xen. *Lac.* 15.9.

360 On the Spartan kings as heroes with continuous cult, see Cartledge 1988. For the designation of the kings as heroes only referring to the funeral, see Parker 1988.

361 Deneken 1886–90, 2505; von Fritze 1903, 66; Stengel 1920, 141–142; Pfister 1909–12, 479–480.

362 Pfister 1909–12, 479–480; Rohde 1925, 140, n. 15.

363 Pfister 1909–12, 479–489.

364 Thus, Pfister 1909–12, 480.

365 For *enagizein*, see above, pp. 82–89.

366 Thuc. 5.11; *LSS* 64, line 9; cf. Rudhardt 1958, 285–286. *Entemnein* used for sacrifices to heroes in later sources: Plut. *Vit. Sol.* 9.1; Plut. *Vit. Pel.* 22.2; Lucian *Scythia* 1; Philostr. *Her.* 53.13.

367 Kontoleon 1970, 45–46, ὡς ἥρω meaning “as if to a hero” in the sense of a hero of epic, not simply a heroized mortal. Cf. Habicht 1970, 172, on ὡσπερ θεῶ and ὡς θεόν referring to the recipient as being a god in cult. See also Scullion 2000, 167–171.

368 Onesilos: Hdt. 5.114; Artachaies: Hdt. 7.117; Timesios: Hdt. 1.168; Brasidas: Thuc. 5.11; Herakles: Hdt. 2.44.

369 Xen. *Hell.* 7.3.12.

370 Isoc. *Hel.* 63.

371 Xen. *Lac.* 15.9. Cf. Parker 1988, 10, who does not believe that the kings were given a continuous hero-cult but that they were given a special status, since their divine descent (*idem* 15.2) led to their being seen as heroes.

372 Hdt. 6.38; cf. discussion in Malkin 1987, 190–200.

373 Hyp. *Epitaph.* 21; cf. Habicht 1970, 28–36; Parker 1996, 257–258.

374 Pind. *Ol.* 7.77–80. Translation by Race 1997.

375 The description of the ritual as a *thysia* with dining is natural, since this was the most common kind of sacrifice in the cult of the gods. In the particular case of Tlapolemos, the emphasis on the sacrifices being performed as if for a god should perhaps be connected with the fact that both the role as a founder and the cult were later transferred from Tlapolemos to the god Helios (see Malkin 1987, 245).

376 Ar. *Tag.* fr. 504, 12–14 (*PCG* III:2, 1984).

377 See below, p. 288, n. 367. For the use of ὡσπερ in the new sacred law from Selinous (Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993), see below, pp. 235–237. In this text, the impure Tritopatores are to receive sacrifices *hóσπερ τοῖς ηερόεσι* (A 10), the pure Tritopatores *hóσπερ τοῖς θεοῖς* (A 17) and the sacrifice to the *elasteros* is to be performed *hóσπερ τοῖς ἀθανάτοις* (B 12–13).

378 Thus, in particular, in the inscriptions: the *theos* Hypodektes (*IG* II² 2501, 20) and the *heros* Egretes (*IG* II² 2499, 25); the Heros Iatros called *theos* (*IG* II² 839, 20, 33 and 45–46); Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion referred to as *theoi* (*IG* II² 1252, 7–8).

379 Hdt. 5.114 and 7.117.

380 Xen. *Hell.* 7.3.12; Thuc. 5.11.

381 Hdt. 1.168. For the institution of the cult, see Malkin 1987, 55–56.

382 Xen. *Lac.* 15.9.

383 It is interesting to note that the cults marked ὥς θεῶ or ὥς ἀθανάτω are referred to as being already in existence and are performed to “old” and well-established heroes of myth, such as Helen and Menelaos, and Herakles.

384 Boedeker 1993, 164–177, on the specific case of Hdt. 1.66–68 (the bones of Orestes); for other cases, see Rohde 1925, 122 with nn. 35–36 and 129 with n. 72. On the importance of oracles at the institution of cults of athletes, see Fontenrose 1968.

385 Malkin 1987, 27–28. Cf. Plato (*Leg.* 738d), who declares that, when a state is created, religious matters must be regulated by an oracle, such as Delphi, Dodona or Ammon, and a plot of land must be assigned to each god, *daimon* or at least to a hero.

386 Pl. *Resp.* 540b–c.

Chapter III. The use and meaning of the rituals in a wider perspective

1

The review of the epigraphical and literary evidence in the previous chapters established a ritual pattern which differs in many ways from the traditional view of the sacrificial rituals of hero-cults. In this chapter, the four ritual categories-- destruction sacrifices, blood rituals, *theoxenia* and *thysia* sacrifices followed by dining--will be discussed in more detail. To understand the place and function of each kind of ritual within hero-cults, it is of interest to see to what extent similar rituals occur in the cult of the gods and the cult of the dead, respectively.

1

2

In trying to understand and explain why certain sacrifices were performed in hero-cults, the traditional approach has been to link the ritual to the character of the recipient. Hero-cults have been considered as originating in the cult of the dead and preserving older traits which later were abandoned in the funerary cult. Furthermore, in the division of Greek religion into Olympian and chthonian spheres, the heroes were firmly placed in the latter and connected with the cult of the dead and to a lesser extent with the cult of the chthonian gods.

2

Consequently, a number of traits and activities commonly understood as chthonian have been ascribed to the heroes, whether or not there is any actual evidence for such a connection.

3

At the same time, it has always been noted that the connection between the character of the recipient and the sacrifices performed is

not absolute. Even though heroes were chthonian, they could receive *thysia* sacrifices, at which the meat from the animal victims was eaten, i.e., the ritual usually considered as being Olympian and reserved for the gods of the sky. This practice has been regarded as unusual and explained as later deviations from the sacrificial norm, as influences of the cult of the gods, as a result of the fact that the hero had not died a proper death but had simply disappeared or as careless usage of the terminology by the ancient sources.

3

4

The alternative approach to the sacrificial practices has been to focus on the ritual itself and on the occasion in which the sacrifice was performed, instead of the character of the recipient. In certain situations, a particular kind of sacrifice had to be performed and the character of the recipient was of little importance or no specific deity was even mentioned as receiving the sacrifice.

5

Of particular interest in this approach are the sacrifices at which no meal took place, such as holocausts and *sphagia*, or rituals in which a more substantial part of the animal victim was destroyed than was the usual practice, since these are the rituals that have usually been considered as being chthonian and as expressing the chthonian character of the recipient. Arthur Darby Nock called these actions *heilige Handlungen* and meant that non-participation in these sacrifices was a result of the purpose and atmosphere of the ritual, as well as the disposition and aspect imputed to the recipients rather than their identity or supposed habitat.

4

Michael Jameson has advocated the view of Greek sacrifices as consisting of, on the one hand, the normal type of sacrifice, *thysia*, and, on the other, of a variety of “powerful actions” which could be used to modify and colour the *thysia*, depending on the purpose and context of the rite.

5

Sarah Peirce divides the sacrifices according to the presence or absence of consumption and not after the divine destination of the ritual. An animal at a *thysia* sacrifice had a different kind of “sacrality” than an animal at an *enagismos*, since the latter was linked with notions and observances of darkness and pollution.

The stressing of the ritual before the recipient has been most strongly advocated by Fritz Graf in a study on libations, in which he argues that the libations were chosen according to the inner logic of the ritual rather than to the character of the recipient of the sacrifice.

Also Walter Burkert notes that different kinds of sacrifices, both complete destruction of the victim by fire and partial burning followed by a meal, could exist within the same ritual.

1. Destruction sacrifices

1.1. The complete or partial destruction of the animal victim in the cult of the gods

At a *thysia*, only the non-edible parts of the victim were burnt and the rest of the meat was available for consumption by the worshippers. The complete opposite to such a sacrifice was a holocaust, meaning that the whole victim was destroyed in the fire.

Between these two poles, the holocaust, leaving no meat to dine on, and the *thysia*, at which all the meat was eaten, other degrees and modes of destruction were possible, which all affected the parts of the animal that fell to the worshippers. The intestines or particular portions of the meat could be cut out and destroyed by burning, either by putting them directly into the fire or by first displaying them on a table and then using them in a *theoxenia* ritual. The blood could be poured out completely, not just splashed on the altar (to be treated below, pp. 242–254). The skin, which was usually the prerogative of the priest, could be burnt or cut into pieces. Finally, a sacrifice could be initiated by the holocaust of one victim, followed by a *thysia* which made use of a second victim or victims. A holocaust could thus replace a *thysia* completely, but the destruction of a whole victim, or only parts of it, could also be used to modify a *thysia* in different ways.

The evidence for complete or partial destruction sacrifices to Greek gods is scattered, but it is evident that the use of sacrifices of this kind was a marginal feature, as regards the actual number of such rituals performed. Two recipients stand out, Zeus and Herakles, to whom can be added a mixed handful of others: the Tritopatores at Selinous, Boubrostis (“The ravenous appetite”), an unnamed god at Epidauros, Artemis and the Charites.

10

Furthermore, the clear majority of the destruction sacrifices, either complete or partial, took place at a *thysia* that concluded with dining. The offerings destroyed often constituted only a minor part of a larger whole, such as a leg of the victim or a ninth part of the meat or an animal of lesser value, such as a piglet.

8

For example, the two holocausts to Zeus mentioned in the extensive, mid-4th-century, sacrificial calendar from Kos, referred to several times previously, were of this kind. Zeus Polieus received a holocaust of a piglet, burnt together with its *splanchna* on the *bomos*, while the rest of the intestines were washed out and burnt by the side of the altar.

11

This holocaust was followed the next day by the sacrifice of an ox, which was concluded by a banquet, since meat portions were distributed and not allowed to be carried away.

12

In the same calendar, Zeus Machaneus was given a piglet burnt in a holocaust on the eleventh of the month of Batromion and on the following day, he received three sheep and an ox or, every alternate year, only three sheep.

13

From these victims, γέρη were distributed and this sacrifice must have been a *thysia* at which the worshippers ate.

9

Zeus Polieus at Thorikos also received a similar sacrifice. In Boedromion, he was given the holocaust of a piglet, as well as a sheep and another piglet, both of which must have been eaten, since they are not marked as *holokautos*.

14

The connection between the sheep/piglet sacrifice and the piglet

holocaust depends on the understanding of the letters ΕΠΑΥΟΜΕΝΑΣ. Daux offered the interpretation “the women acclaiming the god” (ἐπ' Αὐτομένας), while Parker proposed “to Automenai” (ἐπ' Αὐτομενας), i.e., a geographical location.

15

Recently, Scullion has suggested the reading ἐπ' αὐτο μένας, “remaining on the spot/within the sanctuary”.

16

If the first and the third interpretations are followed, the three sacrifices would belong together, the holocaust taking place after the sacrifice of the sheep and the other piglet. This sequence of events, with the holocaust being performed after the sacrifice of the animals meant to be eaten, is rare. The holocaust usually preceded the *thysia* sacrifice (see, for example, the Coan calendar discussed above).

17

The second interpretation would mean that the holocaust took place at a different location or on an occasion different from the preceding sacrifices of the sheep and the piglet. The latter explanation seems preferable, since the priest was to provide the attendant with lunch after the piglet holocaust, an action which would have been unnecessary, had that sacrifice been performed in connection with the other sacrifices, from which there was meat to dine on.

18

10

Another case of a partial destruction sacrifice at a *thysia* to Zeus is to be found in the newly published, sacred law from Selinous. Zeus Meilichios, in the plot or sanctuary of Euthydamos, is to receive sacrifices in two consecutive years.

19

The first year, he is to be given a ram (lines A 17–18). The following year, no recipient or victim is specified but it seems plausible to assume that both were the same as in the previous year, Zeus Meilichios receiving a ram.

20

Apart from the animal sacrifice, there was also to be a *theoxenia* entertainment (A 18–20) and from the table used at this ritual, offerings (*apargmata*) were to be taken and burnt, as well as a thigh and the bones.

21

Thus, the text prescribes the sacrifice of a ram, of which a whole

thigh was to be burnt, as well as some additional meat offerings first placed on the *theoxenia* table.

22

The rest of the meat was eaten, since it was forbidden to carry it away, and the person performing the ritual could invite whomever he wished to participate (A 20).

11

The second major recipient of destruction sacrifices, apart from Zeus, was Herakles. Herodotos speaks of the dual cult of Herakles on Thasos: those Greeks behaved most correctly who performed both *thyein* sacrifices to Herakles as an immortal Olympian and *enagizein* sacrifices to him as a hero.

23

All cases of destruction sacrifices to Herakles, which, on the whole, are quite few, seem to have followed the same scheme: a smaller, non-participatory ritual, in which a part of the victim or a separate animal was destroyed, followed by a second, more substantial sacrifice, from which the meat was eaten. In the calendar from Kos mentioned above, Herakles received a lamb, which was burnt whole (ἀρήν καυτός) and an ox, sacrificed by the priest (τοῦτον θύει ὁ ιαρεύς).

24

The second sacrifice was more elaborate, since there were also to be provided as *hiera* certain quantities of barley, wheat, honey and cheese, i.e., extras usually accompanying a regular *thysia*, as well as a new oven, dry sticks, wood and wine.

25

12

Another case is to be found in a fragmentary inscription from Miletos regulating a cult of Herakles, dated to around 500 BC, prescribing that eating the *splanchna* was not allowed, a stipulation which can be interpreted as meaning that these parts were destroyed, presumably holocausted.

26

The rest of the meat from the animal victim was probably eaten.

13

Sacrifices to Herakles involving partial destruction of the animal victim are also covered by the term ἐναιτεύειν. This term has usually been interpreted as meaning that the meat of the animal was divided

into nine parts, one of which was burnt, even though the contexts in which the term is used do not mention the use of fire.

27

This interpretation is supported by the new sacred law from Selinous, which prescribes for the sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores that “of the nine parts burn one”.

28

14

On Thasos, the term is used in two inscriptions for sacrifices to Herakles, but it is in fact doubtful to what extent sacrifices of this kind were actually performed. The first case, a sacred law, prohibits, among other things, the use of *enateuein* sacrifices in the cult of Herakles Thasios, οὐ [δ]' ἐνατεύεται.

29

The second inscription, a regulation for the lease of the garden of Herakles, is broken just before [ἐ]νατευθῆι, but it is possible that the missing part contained a negation, [οὐδ' ἐ]νατευθῆι, so that also this inscription banned the use of this kind of sacrifice in the cult of Herakles.

30

Thus, the ritual of *enateuein* seems to have been known on Thasos but perhaps not executed. This conclusion receives additional support from the archaeological investigation of the Herakleion on Thasos, which has provided no evidence for a dual cult of Herakles at this site.

31

The mention of the *enateuein* ritual may have functioned as an echo of Herakles' particular history and mythology, which hardly ever was acted out in actual practised cult.

15

The impure and the pure Tritopatores mentioned in the sacred law from Selinous were also recipients of destruction sacrifices. The sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores was to be performed “as (one sacrifices) to the heroes, having poured a libation of wine down through the roof, and of the ninth parts burn one” (τοῖς Τριτοπατρεῦσι τοῖς μιανοῖς ἡόσπερ τοῖς ἡερόεσι, ροῖνον ὑπολῃείψας δι' ὀρόφο καὶ τᾶν μοιρᾶν τᾶν ἐνάταν κατακαίεν μίαν).

32

16

The pure Tritopatores at Selinous were given a full-grown victim

(*teleon*), presumably a sheep, as well as a *theoxenia* ritual (A 13–17). On the table were to be placed a clean cloth, crowns of olive, honey mixture in clean cups, cakes and meat. The text further stipulates that, from the food on the table, offerings were to be made and burnt.

33

At this sacrifice, too, some of the meat was destroyed, but presumably less than at the sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores.

17

The editors considered the impure and pure Tritopatores as two versions of the same deities, who had been polluted, presumably by bloodshed and violent death within the society, but were brought back to a pure state by the ninth-part sacrifice.

34

Furthermore, they suggested that the impure Tritopatores did not receive any victim of their own and that the meat portion to be burnt was taken from the two victims sacrificed to Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides, and to Zeus Meilichios, at the rituals preceding the sacrifices to the Tritopatores.

35

Each of these two victims would have provided a ninth part and one of these was burnt to the impure Tritopatores.

18

It seems strange, however, that the actions of humans should have been powerful enough to pollute deities and that sacrifices could in fact change their condition from impure to pure.

36

This difficulty is avoided if the Tritopatores are considered as being permanently of two types, impure and pure, as has been argued by Kevin Clinton on linguistic grounds.

37

Moreover, Clinton has pointed out the rarity of one divinity receiving parts of a victim sacrificed to another deity and has proposed that the impure Tritopatores must have received their own victim, of which a ninth part of the meat was burnt.

38

19

In any case, the ninth-part destruction can be said to have modified a *thysia* ending with dining. If the portion burnt came from one of the victims sacrificed to Zeus Eumenes, the Eumenides and Zeus Meilichios, the remaining portions (eight out of nine) of meat must

have been eaten. Furthermore, if the impure and pure Tritopatores were just two sides of the same deities, the ninth-part destruction could also be considered as initiating and modifying the subsequent *thysia* to the pure Tritopatores.

39

On the other hand, if Clinton's interpretation is followed, which in many ways seems the more preferable, the impure Tritopatores would be separate divinities who were given their own victim, a ninth part of which was burnt. This sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores would have been a *thysia* modified by a partial destruction, just like the sacrifices to Zeus and Herakles outlined above, but in this case, it was stipulated that the destruction should comprise a ninth part of the meat.

40

20

To destroy the skin of the animal sacrificed, either by cutting it up or burning it, also constitutes a partial destruction. Two such cases are to be found in the Erchia calendar at sacrifices of goats to Artemis at Erchia.

41

In both of these sacrifices, the meat was eaten, as is clear from the *ouphora* demand. Another partial destruction of the skin of the victim was made at a sacrifice to the Charites on Kos, in connection with an oath ceremony.

42

21

The destruction sacrifices considered so far all took place in the context of *thysiai* and were followed by dining. The burning of a portion of the victim sacrificed or of a separate, smaller victim comprised only part of the ritual, often being performed at the beginning of the sacrifice. Holocausts not accompanied by any *thysia* are rarer and can be demonstrated only in a few cases, some of which are in fact doubtful.

22

The most extreme case of a complete destruction sacrifice concerns Boubrostis ("The ravenous appetite"), who received a holocaust from the people of Smyrna, according to Metrodoros, a 4th-century BC historian quoted by Plutarch.

43

The victim was a black bull, which was sacrificed and cut up and burnt entirely, hide and all: θύουσι Βουβρώσται ταῦρον μέλανα καὶ κατακόψαντες αὐτόδορον ὀλοκαυτοῦσιν . Here, there is no indication of any meal taking place. Another example of a single holocaust, though involving a smaller victim, is found in the Erchia calendar. According to this inscription, Zeus Epopetes was given the holocaust of a piglet on the 25th of Metageitnion.

44

No other victim was sacrificed on the same occasion, either to Zeus or to any other divinity.

23

In the *Anabasis*, Xenophon describes a situation in which he had run out of money and the seer Eukleides suggested a sacrifice to Zeus Meilichios, since Xenophon used to *thyesthai* and *holokautein* to this god at home (7.8.4–5). Xenophon ἐθύετο καὶ ὠλοκαύτει χοίρους τῷ πατρίῳ νόμῳ, καὶ ἐκαλλιέρει, “he sacrificed and performed holocausts of piglets, as was the custom of his fathers, and obtained favourable omens”. The same day, the money for the army arrived. It is possible, however, that this sacrifice consisted of two rituals, a holocaust of piglets and a regular *thysia* of another victim or victims, since good omens were obtained (*kallierein*), a procedure which it must have been difficult to perform, had the sacrifice been solely a holocaust.

45

24

Finally, a slightly later case is an Epidaurian inscription mentioning the ὀλοκαύτησις performed to an unnamed god, τῷ θεῷ, usually identified as Asklepios.

46

The inscription records contributions of money for the *holokautesis*, made by individuals from all over Greece on behalf of themselves and their families. The text offers no indication of what was to be purchased for the money and burnt completely. No other sacrificial terms are used in the inscription and it is possible that the *holokautesis* meant only a sacrifice of incense or cakes.

47

25

Since complete or partial destruction sacrifices were so uncommon, it is particularly interesting to consider whether these rituals can be

regarded as a manifestation of the character of the deities receiving them or as a result of the contexts in which they were performed. No conclusive answer can be given, since, in most cases, it is possible to argue for both approaches.

26

If by chthonian character is meant a connection with the earth, in the aspects of both fertility and agriculture and as the place where the dead reside, most of the recipients of destruction sacrifices can be fitted into this category.

48

A connection with fertility and agriculture can be argued for Zeus Polieus, Zeus Machaneus and Zeus Meilichios.

49

The Tritopatores were the collective dead ancestors but were concerned with fertility as well.

50

They were also identified with the winds and counted among the powers of the weather and mountain-top Zeuses, such as Zeus Epopetes. These powers were similar in temperament to the chthonians and therefore received chthonian worship.

51

The *ou phora* stipulation, i.e., the ban on removing meat from the sanctuary after a sacrifice, it has been suggested, is a further sign of chthonian cult, and therefore the sacrifice to Artemis, at which the skins were torn, can be explained as being related to her character as well.

52

Herakles and Asklepios both began as mortal heroes, though they were later transformed into gods, and the destruction sacrifices have been seen as an indication of this origin.

53

27

Still, if these rituals are to be viewed as an expression of the chthonian character of the recipients, it is remarkable that such sacrifices can so rarely be demonstrated. If we take the cases of Herakles and Asklepios, for example, in whom the chthonian side would be expected to be particularly prominent, considering the fact that they both had died before becoming divine, the evidence for destruction sacrifices is meagre. Only a small fraction of the rituals to

Herakles can be shown to have included the burning of a substantial part of the animal or a separate victim.

54

For Asklepios, there is even less evidence for holocausts and the only documented case seems to be the *holokautesis* inscription from Epidauros.

55

Moreover, even though Asklepios can be taken as a likely candidate for this sacrifice, it has to be remembered that he is not named in this document, since the *holokautesis* is only said to be performed “to the god”. To consider this ritual as being a particularly “heroic” sacrifice, as has often been done, seems odd, since the inscription says explicitly that the *holokautesis* is performed “to the god” and not “to the hero”.

56

28

If we leave the character of the recipient and turn to the context in which the sacrifice is performed, the destruction sacrifices can in most cases also be shown to be connected with a situation in which a society or an individual is faced with threats, danger or problems. The performance of the sacrifices, either in a single instance or in the form of the institution of a cult, was aimed at resolving the crisis.

57

29

The sacrifices to Zeus Meilichios were performed by Xenophon in order to procure funds for the army, while the holocaust of a bull to “The ravenous appetite” (Boubrostis) was meant to keep starvation away. The rituals of Zeus Polieus, which included holocausts of piglets, at least at Kos and Thorikos, and perhaps also at Athens, have been linked to the prosperity of the crops and the community.

58

At Athens, the sacrifices to Zeus Polieus were performed at the Dipoleia, a festival said to emanate from the murder of an animal which led to drought and barrenness of the country, a problem which was solved by the collective slaughter and consumption of an ox.

59

The sacrifice to Zeus Machaneus at Kos also included the holocaust of a pig, followed by the *thysia* of a bull and three sheep, and was probably copied from the cult of Zeus Polieus and may have had a

similar meaning.

60

The destruction of the skin of the goat sacrificed to the Charites at an oath ceremony may also be connected with the situation: in oaths, the blood of the victim was usually discarded and the rest of the animal also destroyed.

61

The destruction sacrifices to Zeus Meilichios and the Tritopatores, mentioned in the sacred law from Selinous, can be related to the situation, if the editors' interpretation is followed, which suggests that the purpose of the whole inscription was to regulate purification, probably needed after some kind of crisis, for example, civil war or another form of extraordinary death, or perhaps to deal with the *miasma* arising from ineffective funerary rites.

62

In the cases of Herakles and Asklepios (if the latter received destruction sacrifices at all), there are no direct indications of why rituals of these kinds were practised on certain occasions but the small number of instances in total suggests that external conditions may have had an effect on the choice of sacrifices in these particular cases.

30

It is thus possible to link the destruction sacrifices both to the character of the recipient and to the situation when the sacrifice was performed: one of these approaches is not more obvious than the other and no distinct conclusion can be reached. More evident, however, is the fact that destruction sacrifices formed part of the sacrificial practices of the gods, but they were rarely performed and usually took place in connection with *thysiai* followed by dining. In most cases, the destroyed part constituted only a portion of the victim or a small and cheap animal. The principle of these sacrifices seems to be that of destroying a smaller entity to rescue the rest: a ninth part of the meat, some of the meat from the *theoxenia* table, a piglet before the sacrifice of a sheep or an ox.

63

The holocaust of a whole ox to Boubrostitis stands out, but the renunciation of the largest and most expensive animal was probably the only action considered to be sufficient to ward off the threat of starvation.

1.2. The destruction of the animal victims in the cult of the dead

31

Of central importance in discussing the use of destruction sacrifices in the cult of the dead is the question whether animal sacrifice formed a part of the rituals performed to the dead or not, either at the funeral or in the subsequent practices at the grave. The destruction of other offerings (food, clothes, equipment for the dead person) is of less interest here.

32

Modern scholars have often assumed that animal sacrifice, including the destruction of the victim, used to form part of the rituals at the burial and the cult of the dead. The main evidence cited for this view is the Homeric epics and, in particular, the description of the funeral of Patroklos in the *Iliad*.

65

It has usually been considered that, from the historical period onwards, animal sacrifice was not frequently performed and gradually came to be replaced by libations and the offerings of cakes and various kinds of food.

66

In fact, the evidence for animal sacrifice to the dead in the Archaic and Classical periods is both rare and difficult to interpret. We are best informed of the situation in Attica, but the evidence from outside this region seems to concur more or less with the Athenian practices.

33

Judging from the written sources, animal sacrifice in connection with the burial seems, already in the Archaic period, to have been considered as an act of the past. In the laws of Solon, as they are quoted by Plutarch, it is stated that the sacrifice of an ox was no longer to be permitted, ἐναγίζειν δὲ βοῦν οὐκ εἶασεν

67

Also in the *Minos*, a late 4th century dialogue wrongly ascribed to Plato, it is declared that, in accordance with the former laws regarding the dead, victims were slaughtered before the funeral

procession set out.

68

It is also interesting to note the complete absence of any reference to animal sacrifice on the Attic, white-ground lekythoi with funerary motifs.

69

Furthermore, none of the representations of animal sacrifice on pottery or stone reliefs covered by the study by van Straten can be connected with the cult of the dead.

70

34

One of the rare examples of animal sacrifice in a context dealing with the ordinary dead is to be found in a funerary law from Ioulis on Keos, dated to the 5th century BC, which states that a *prosphagion* was to be performed according to ancestral custom.

71

Presumably this sacrifice took place before the burial and the deceased must have received the *prosphagion* as a grave offering. The victim was probably killed at the grave and deposited whole in the grave or burnt with the corpse.

35

This interpretation is complicated by the fact that the funerary laws, both the one from Ioulis and other examples, are concerned with restricting the funerary practices: the number of mourners, their dress, the number of grave offerings accompanying the deceased, the period of mourning.

72

In such a context, animal sacrifice to the ordinary dead seems like an extravagance and at least in Athens, the killing of the most prestigious victim, an ox, was forbidden in the laws of Solon. It is possible that the *prosphagion* is to be considered as having been performed to a divinity and not to the deceased. Sacrifices to gods, both the “Olympian” kind and those connected with the underworld, were made after the burial, when the family and the house had been purified, and the meat from these sacrifices was eaten at the funeral meal.

73

However, the *prosphagion* seems to have taken place before the burial, when the family was still ritually impure.

74

It cannot therefore be understood as a regular *thysia* from which the meat was to be eaten, since the family could not participate in such sacrifices.

75

Thus, the *prosphagion* is probably to be taken as an animal sacrifice to the ordinary dead but probably performed on a small scale on the private level and not resulting in any meat for the family of the deceased.

36

To define the occurrence of animal sacrifice in the cult of the dead, a substantial investigation of the archaeological material would be needed, which is, of course, outside the scope of this study. Works on burial practices and funerary rituals, however, show that animal bones are not frequently found in or at graves and, when this is the case, the quantities are often small. On the whole, the finds of animal bones seem to be too scanty to support the notion of animals either being burnt in a holocaust or sacrificed and eaten at the grave on a regular basis. The animal bones rather represent portions of meat, raw or cooked, being given to the dead, burnt on the pyre or placed in the grave. Furthermore, bones are recovered only from some of the graves in a certain plot or cemetery and it seems clear that food offerings consisting of meat were not given to all the dead. Perhaps meal offerings were considered to be a particularly prestigious gift, which was reserved for the most distinguished burials.

76

37

In the 7th- and 6th-century BC material from the Kerameikos, for example, animal bones were found only occasionally and consisted of tiny fragments.

77

Moreover, the range of the pottery in each offering-trench, regarding the number of shapes and the composition of vase-shapes, is too uneven to be interpreted as dining equipment used by the mourners. It may rather have served as a reference to dining and does not have to be interpreted as evidence for actual banquets taking place.

78

Of the around 100 Archaic graves excavated on Thera, only 15 yielded animal bones and in the ashes from the offering-pits near some of the graves, only small fragments of animal bones were recovered.

From a LG grave plot with 22 burials in the Athenian Agora, small fragments of animal bones were recovered in the burnt deposits in or near four of the graves.

38

At the Knossos North cemetery, the Early Greek tombs yielded animal bones from joints of meat in four cases, and teeth, maybe representing amulets, were also found in some graves.

The only remains that seemed to be those of animal sacrifices were two major deposits, clearly different from the bones serving as food offerings, since they consisted of skeletons of horses and dogs, animals that were never eaten. These animals had been sacrificed at the tombs and not at the pyres.

In the North cemetery at Corinth, many of the Geometric graves yielded quantities of charcoal but only some fragments of animal bones, while in the Classical to Roman graves, no traces of food were observed, apart from shells of hen's eggs and sea-shells, the latter probably being toys.

39

The new, extensive investigations of cemeteries in the Greek colonies in the west show a similar pattern. Of the 359 burials investigated at Metaponto, only 13 yielded any kind of animal bones.

Of these, four cases were skeletons, whole or fragmentary, from pets or work animals, while in four other graves were found sheep and goat astragaloi, sometimes in great numbers, which were probably used as decorative art pieces or toys.

Bones that could definitely be interpreted as food remains were only recovered in five tombs, i.e., in less than 1.5 % of the total number of graves.

In the Archaic cemetery at Morgantina, animal bones taken to be food offerings were discovered in three tombs.

The bones are identified as sheep, pig and ox, and are in two cases

mixed with the human bones and pottery, suggesting them to belong to the rituals executed in connection with the burial. The assumption that meat offerings were prestigious and unusual gifts reserved for only a minority of the dead is further supported by the fact that the three tombs with this kind of offerings in the Morgantina cemetery were located together.

40

In all, though it has been assumed that animal sacrifice used to be performed to the ordinary dead, there is, even in the Archaic period, very little evidence for such practices.

88

Neither the written nor the archaeological evidence indicates that animal sacrifice and dining by the mourners at the tombs of the ordinary dead was a regular practice in the Archaic and the Classical periods. Holocaustic sacrifices of animals were not a part of the cult of the dead, but portions of meat, either raw or cooked, were occasionally given to the dead and burnt on the pyre, even though this practice also seems to have decreased in time.

89

41

The reasons for destroying the offerings to the dead, whatever they consisted of, can be linked to the practices at the burial, at which some gifts were deposited in the grave, while others were burnt together with the corpse on the pyre. More specifically, the destruction has been considered as being a necessity, since the dead could not profit from the offerings unless they had been burnt. The ghost of Melissa, the dead wife of Periander, for example, explicitly asked for her clothes to be burned so that she would be able to use them.

90

Similarly, the burning of food on the pyre has been seen as a way of feeding the dead or at least providing them with necessities in the next life.

91

42

It has also been suggested that the destruction of the offerings functioned as a way of channelling the grief and anger felt by the relatives of the dead person.

92

Still, the same ritual may very well have had different meanings for different individuals depending on the time and place. Andromache's burning of Hektor's clothes after his death may be interpreted both as an action to assure that the dead man will receive them and as a means for his widow to act out her loss and despair. At the same time, to burn the clothes can be seen as a way of increasing Hektor's *kleos*, since this is all that will survive after his death.

93

Possibly, the destruction of the offerings to the dead may be linked to the fact that the actual death, the burials and the handling of the dead body, as well as subsequent visits to the grave, all involved various degrees of pollution. The burning of the offerings to the dead could perhaps be viewed as a way of dealing with this pollution, just as the water used for purification when the corpse was in the house had to be poured out and the sweepings from the floors were discarded at the tomb.

94

1.3. *Enagizein* sacrifices in hero-cults and the cult of the dead, and the relation to the term *holokautos*

43

In chapter I, it was argued that the terms *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* were, above all, used for sacrifices to dead recipients, either the ordinary dead or heroes. The dead status of a hero receiving *enagizein* sacrifices is often underlined by the mention of his grave, the manner of his death or by a contrast with the cults and sanctuaries of the immortal gods.

44

Furthermore, *enagizein* and the relevant nouns referred to sacrifices at which no dining took place, either in hero-cults or in the cult of the dead. At an *enagizein* sacrifice, the offerings were completely consecrated, usually by burning them, and nothing was left for those who brought them. Even though the same terms were used for both hero-cults and the cult of the dead, the contents of the offerings differed, depending on whether the recipient was a hero or an ordinary mortal. The contents of the *enagizein* sacrifices in hero-cults are rarely specified, but the ritual usually seems to have comprised

animal sacrifice. The offerings in the cult of the dead, on the other hand, consisted of cakes, fruit, prepared food, flowers and wreaths, as well as libations. The common denominator in the use of *enagizein* in hero-cults and the cult of the dead was not the contents of the offerings, but the dead status of the recipients and the absence of dining, since the offerings were destroyed.

45

If *enagizein* in hero-cults referred to a ritual in which the meat of the animal victims was destroyed by burning and no banquet followed, what was then the difference, if any, between a sacrifice covered by *enagizein* and one designated as *holokautos*? At a sacrifice marked as *holokautos*, the whole victim was also destroyed and nothing was left to be eaten.

95

It is possible that the distinction simply reflects the usage of different kinds of terminology in the literary and epigraphical sources in the period under study here, *enagizein* being the literary equivalent of *holokautos*, *kautos* or *karpoein* in the inscriptions. In the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, the vocabulary of the inscriptions became more diversified and the terms *enagizein* and *enagismos* were used in the epigraphical material as well.

96

A further sign of this development is the term *enagisterion*, which is found once in a 2nd-century AD inscription.

97

46

Another explanation of the distinction between an *enagizein* sacrifice and a *holokautos* concerns who was the recipient of the sacrifice and the attitude which the worshippers took towards the recipient. The common denominator between the recipients of the *enagizein* sacrifices, the heroes and the deceased, is that they are all dead. In the Archaic and the Classical periods, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are never used for sacrifices to gods, either in inscriptions or in literary texts. When the terms occur in the inscriptions in late Hellenistic times, the recipients of the sacrifices are still only heroes and the ordinary dead. In the literary sources, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* may occasionally be used for sacrifices to gods, but it should be noted that all instances but one date to the 2nd century AD or later, when the terms seem to have taken on the more general

meaning of “to burn completely, no matter who was the recipient”.

98

Moreover, the gods receiving *enagizein* sacrifices often show a connection with the realm of the dead and the rituals are performed in an atmosphere removed from that of the joyful *thysia* sacrifices.

47

Thus, in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* were not used for sacrifices to Greek gods, since they were considered to be immortal. The three terms were reserved for dead recipients and often carried with them a notion of burials, graves and violent death, incompatible with the sphere of the gods. *Holokautos*, on the other hand, does not seem to have had any such particular connotations in this period and could therefore be used for both heroes and gods. This term must have been more neutral, meaning “to burn completely”, without any particular bearing on the recipient, while *enagizein* was used for the same kind of activity but also indicated the dead status of the recipient.

99

1.4. Destruction sacrifices in hero-cults

48

In discussing the function of destruction sacrifices in hero-cults, the problem is the lack of information regarding the particulars of the situation when the sacrifices were performed or any specific traits in the character of the recipient. The starting point, however, must be the small number of cases in which rituals of these kinds can be demonstrated in hero-cults. Before discussing the evidence for heroes outlined previously, it is of interest to take a closer look at the sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores in the Selinous *lex sacra*, a ritual said to be performed “as one sacrifices to the heroes”, “, *ἡόσπCEφι τοῖς ἡερόεσι*, since this text may seem to contradict the conclusion that destruction sacrifices were rare in hero-cults. The whole passage runs as follows:

100

τοῖς Τρ-

10 ιτοπατρεῦσι. τοῖς μιανοῖς ἡόσπερ τοῖς ἡερόεσι, ποῖνον
ὑπολῃει-

ψας ' δι' ὁρόφο καὶ τᾶν μοιρᾶν - τᾶν ἐνάταν - κατανα-

ίεν - μίαν. θυόντο θῦμα : καὶ καταγιζόντο ἡοῖς ἡοσία - καὶ

περιρά-
ναντες καταλινάντο

(Sacrifice) to the Tritopatores, the impure, as (one sacrifices) to the heroes, having poured a libation of wine down through the roof, and of the nine parts burn one. Let those to whom it is permitted perform sacrifice and consecrate, and having performed aspersion let them perform the anointing.

101

49

The sacrifice that the impure Tritopatores receive must, in some way, have encompassed rituals which were considered as particular for heroes, or the stipulation would have been meaningless. At first, it may seem obvious to take this passage as an indication of partial destruction of the animal victim being a standard ritual in hero-cults.

102

However, the survey of the occurrence of this kind of ritual behaviour in other contexts than hero-cults has shown that the destruction of a more substantial part of the meat than at a *thysia* sacrifice cannot simply be considered a typically heroic ritual. From the evidence discussed above, it is clear that partial destructions of the animal victims were used also in the cult of the gods, in particular for Zeus in various guises, but also for Artemis and the Charites. Therefore, the heroic side of this sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores ritual has to be further considered.

50

Which rituals does the stipulation *hóσπερ τοῖς η̑ρόεσι* actually refer to? The text states that a libation of wine is to be poured through the roof and that one of the nine portions of meat is to be burnt. Presumably these two actions make up the contents of a sacrifice “as to the heroes”. To perform a ritual “as to the heroes” cannot, however, have been self-evident, or the contents of the ritual would not have had to be outlined as clearly as, in fact, it is done here.

103

51

The wine libation through the roof has been compared to similar practices in hero-cults, for example, the pouring of liquids into the tomb of the hero, but, on the whole, there is very little comparanda for the use of this kind of ritual in hero-cults.

104

The verb used to describe the pouring, *hypoleibein*, seems to refer to the physical action of pouring a liquid down, in this case through the roof of a structure. The term does not seem to have any particular heroic connotations, since it is used also for the libation at the sacrifice to the pure Tritopatores, which is specified as being performed “as to the gods”.

105

Possibly it is the content of the libation, wine, that is to be taken as being heroic. Wineless offerings, such as the *melikraton* offered to the pure Tritopatores, have often been claimed to be characteristic for the dead and the divinities connected with the underworld, but they seem to have been the exception rather than the rule in hero-cults.

106

To libate wine is therefore perhaps to be seen as using a ritual from hero-cults also in the cult of the Tritopatores.

52

What may have been particularly heroic, however, was the division of the meat from the victim into *nine* parts, one of which was burnt. The contents of the partial destructions used in the cult of gods are less well defined, consisting of a leg of a ram, offerings from the *theoxenia* table or a separate, small victim, usually a piglet. The partial destruction of a ninth of the meat is a very distinct stipulation, which is known only from two other instances, both heroic: Herakles on Thasos and Semele on Mykonos.

107

As for the division of the meat into nine parts, it is interesting to note that the priest of Herakles in the Salaminioi inscription from Attica was to be given nine pieces of flesh from the ox sacrificed to Herakles at Sounion.

108

53

The heroic rituals at the sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores can therefore be suggested to have consisted primarily of the division of the meat into nine portions and the burning of one of these, perhaps in connection with the contents of the libation being wine. To assume that a destruction of a ninth of the meat was commonly performed at all sacrifices to heroes seems, however, to be pressing the evidence too far, considering the small number of instances when this kind of ritual can be ascertained.

That the impure Tritopatores received rituals also used in hero-cults is not surprising, considering the fact that both the Tritopatores, being the collective ancestors, and the heroes were dead and therefore would be expected to receive sacrifices of the same kind. It is possible that the destruction of the meat of the animal victims to the impure Tritopatores is to be seen as connected to their impurity. The impurity of the impure Tritopatores is of course beyond dispute but if this character trait may be related to the partial destruction of the animal victim in this case, the same explanation may also be valid for the use of similar rituals in hero-cults. This argument may be supported by the use of *enagizein* and *enagismata* for destruction sacrifices to the heroes. These terms seem to have marked the recipients as being dead but, at the same time, it is possible that the rituals covered by these terms are to be seen as engendered by the dead character of the recipient and perhaps also as a response to or a recognition of a certain impure quality.

109

If we now turn to the rest of the evidence, a connection between the destruction sacrifices and the character of the recipients can be argued for in some instances. Just as in the case of the impure Tritopatores, the rituals are here to be taken as a recognition of the impurity rather than as an attempt to purify the recipient. The use of *enagizein* sacrifices to Herakles in his aspect as a hero can be seen as connecting him with the sphere of the dead and marking him as having a mortal side. However, destruction sacrifices were rare in his cult and it was apparently not necessary to show his dual character as both a mortal hero and an immortal god at all sacrifices and he seems mainly to have been perceived as a god.

110

The mythical background of Herakles may have lent itself to local interpretations, which in some cases led to particular rituals.

111

From the ritual point of view, Herakles occupies a unique position in Greek religion and has a ritual pattern similar to that of Zeus, when it comes to destruction sacrifices. Apart from being both a hero and a god, it is also possible that the manner of Herakles' death--committing suicide by burning himself to death--may have affected

the rituals practised in his cult. On Mount Oite, where this event was said to have taken place, Herakles had a cult centred on a large pyre with a bonfire, but *thysia* sacrifices also seem to have been performed. However, the rituals at this particular site can be viewed as belonging to a complex of fire rituals known also from other sites in central Greece and the myth of Herakles may have been adapted to fit these rituals.

112

56

In connection with Herakles, it is of interest to consider the holocaust to his close friend Iolaos. Such a ritual is known in one case only to this hero, who was given a sheep burnt whole, when the *genos* of the Salaminioi celebrated their main festival in the Herakleion at Porthmos, Sounion.

113

Iolaos (a variant spelling of Ioleos) was worshipped also at Marathon, but in this calendar there are no indications of the sacrifice being anything but a regular a *thysia* followed by dining.

114

As in the case of Herakles, all sacrifices to Ioleos did not have to be holocausts. At Sounion, the holocaust to Ioleos formed part of a complex of sacrifices: Herakles was given an ox, Kourotrophos a goat, Alkmene, Maia, Ion (every second year) and the Hero at the Hale each received a sheep, while the Hero at Antisara and the Hero at Pyrgilion were given a piglet each.

115

Since Ioleos did not receive holocausts at other locations, this destruction sacrifice is rather to be considered as depending on the local context and, perhaps most of all, on the fact that he was worshipped in connection with Herakles. Annie Verbanck-Piérard has proposed the attractive suggestion that in this case, instead of performing a holocaust to Herakles to mark his mortal side, a sacrifice of this kind was made to his close companion, the mortal Ioleos.

116

57

The holocausts and partial destruction sacrifices to Herakles may thus have depended on local conditions and contexts. Also in the case of Ioleos it has been proposed that it was the particular ritual context

where his sacrifice was performed that influenced the holocaust. It is therefore possible to argue that the situation when the sacrifices were performed may have been just as, or even more, essential than the character of the recipient. The situation in which the ritual was performed seems definitely to have been decisive in the case of the *enagizein* sacrifices to the Phokaiaians, stoned by the people of Agylla.

117

Here, the rituals were clearly a response to the problems caused by the violent and unjust deaths of these Greeks. The cult was aimed at placating the anger of the recipients. The *enagizein* sacrifices were originally meant to solve the immediate problems arising from the stoning of the Greek prisoners of war, but sacrifices of this kind continued to be the standard ritual in this cult. On the other hand, the cult was probably performed at the site where the Phokaiaians had been killed and buried and the *enagizein* sacrifices may have been practised as a kind of funerary cult, though with games and horse-races.

118

58

About the holocausts to the heroine Basile and the hero Epops mentioned in the sacrificial calendar from Erchia, there is not much additional information.

119

Basile was worshipped at other locations in Attica, apart from Erchia, and had a major precinct in Athens, together with Kodros and Neleus, but no details are known of how the sacrifices were performed in her Athenian *temenos*.

120

Epops is not known to have received any cult, except that at Erchia.

59

It has been suggested that the sacrifices to Epops on the 5th of Boedromion may have been linked to the state festival of Genesia on the same day, when the dead were honoured, since Epops received wineless holocausts, an offering considered as being appropriate for the dead.

121

Another possibility would be to link Epops with the commemoration of the war dead who fell at Marathon, which may have taken place on the same date.

A connection between Epops and war can be argued from a passage in the *Aetia* of Kallimachos, which mentions Epops as helping the deme Erchia in a conflict with Paiania.

Epops may have been a local, war-related hero who received a holocaust, perhaps serving as a reminder of the fallen at Marathon who were cremated on the battlefield.

60

It is interesting, however, to note how the holocausts to Epops, Basile and Zeus Epopetes, mentioned in the Erchia calendar, are related in time. Zeus Epopetes received his holocaust on the 25th of Metageitnion, Basile hers on the 4th of Boedromion and the two holocausts to Epops were performed on the 5th of the same month. These four sacrifices are concentrated in a period of ten days during which no other sacrifices were performed (at least not by the demesmen of Erchia). Since they make up a distinct group, they may have had a specific purpose.

The end of Metageitnion and the beginning of Boedromion would fall somewhere around the middle of August to the middle of September, depending on how the ancient months are co-ordinated with the modern calendar.

This is the time of the year after the harvest and before the rains, when the fields lie barren, dry and burnt and no vegetation has begun to sprout. Perhaps these holocausts are to be seen as connected with this particular “dead” period, aimed at dealing with problems stemming from the warm season but maybe also serving as a kind of placation of the gods in order to achieve the wind and the weather necessary for the crops to grow.

61

In some cases, finally, we simply cannot discern the reasons behind the execution of the destruction sacrifices: too little is known of both the recipients and the cultic contexts. There is no additional information on the *enagizein* sacrifices performed in the cult of the Atreidai, Tydeidai, Aiakidai and Laertiadai at Taras which could hint

why these sacrifices were performed.

128

The cults of these groups of heroes, or descendants of heroes, were contrasted with the *thysia* sacrifices, followed by dining, for the Agamemnonidai on a separate occasion. Similarly, in the case of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, little is known, apart from the fact that they received *enagismata*, performed by the polemarch.

129

These two heroes had died a violent death, being slain at the Panathenaia, and their cult was close to that of the war dead, though there seems to have been a difference between the *enagismata* to Harmodios and Aristogeiton and the funerary games and cult of the war dead.

130

62

To sum up, the function of the destruction sacrifices in hero-cults cannot be given a uniform explanation. On the one hand, the use of destruction sacrifices to heroes can be connected to the fact that the heroes were dead and therefore received *enagizein* sacrifices, just like the ordinary departed. In those cases, the sacrifices mark this particular character trait of the hero and may also have served as a means of recognizing in ritual a certain degree of impurity, which can be further emphasized by contrasting this ritual with the *thysia* sacrifices of the immortal sphere. Considering how rarely destruction sacrifices were performed in hero-cults, the dead character of the recipient seems to have been of importance only on a few occasions.

63

On the other hand, destruction sacrifices can also be used as a response to a difficult and dangerous situation, which is remedied by cult. By destroying the offerings, the recipient is propitiated and placated and the conditions are improved. The principle here seems to have been to completely surrender a part or a portion to save the rest and the extent of the offerings depended on the gravity of the situation: the graver the situation, the more was destroyed.

2. Blood rituals

2.1. Blood on the altar and the purpose of the

64

In order to clarify the role of blood rituals in hero-cults, the use of the blood at regular *thysia* sacrifices must first be considered. The common opinion among scholars has been that the blood of the animal was used for pouring or splashing on the altar and that the blood that did not end up on the altar was poured out.

131

The blood has been considered as constituting the god's part of the sacrifice, together with any other libations made and the *knise* from the bones, the fat and the non-edible intestines burnt in the altar fire.

65

To stain the altars with blood from the sacrificial victims was an important part of the sacrifice. This action, αἱμάσσειν τοὺς βωμούς, is mentioned in many literary sources.

132

It is also evidenced in a number of vase-paintings which clearly show the bloodstains on the altar (Figs. 4 and 7).

133

The question is, whether the blood was really meant to cover the whole altar. The bloodstains depicted on the altars are prominent but fairly small and in no case is the whole altar shown as covered with blood. If the altar was supposed to be drenched in blood, it seems odd that the bloodstains shown are of such a moderate size. Furthermore, if the blood was poured out over the altar, it would have extinguished the sacrificial fire already at the beginning of the sacrifice, before the *splanchna* had been grilled.



Fig. 7. Preparations for the killing of a piglet. Athenian red-figure kylix, c. 525–550 BC, Paris, Louvre. From Stengel 1920, pl. 3, fig. 12.

66

The handling of the blood from the victim is believed to have depended on its size. Small animals were lifted up above the altar and their throats were slit so that the blood would pour out over the altar.

134

The clearest, but also unique, representation of this action, or rather the stage preceding this action, is found on the tondo of an Athenian red-figure kylix showing a man lifting up a piglet, while another man clutches a large knife (Fig. 7).

135

Perhaps at this sacrifice the blood of the piglet was to cover the altar, but it is not shown in the vase-painting (the altar has bloodstains from previous sacrifices, though). Owing to the uniqueness of this vase-painting, it is possible that the action shown is not even a regular *thysia*. The animal to be sacrificed is a piglet or a small pig, and perhaps the ritual depicted is a purification sacrifice, which was regularly performed with this kind of animal.

136



Fig. 8. *Mageiroi* cutting up a ram lying on its back on a table, under which the *sphageion* is centrally placed. Athenian black-figure pelike, c. 500 BC, Paris, Collection Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais.

67

Larger animals were first stunned, then killed and the blood gathered in a bowl or basin. This vessel, the *sphageion*, is shown on a number of vase-paintings and is also known from written sources (Figs. 8, 9 and 12).

137

It is usually considered that, for practical reasons, the blood was first collected in this vessel and then splashed onto the altar. However, why collect the blood in such large vessels as those shown on the vase-paintings, if only a small amount was needed to stain the altar, while most of the blood would be discarded shortly afterwards?

68

It is possible that both the use and the size of the *sphageion* are to be explained by its also fulfilling an alimentary purpose. The blood was first collected in this vessel or in a wider and shallower bowl, and

some of it was splashed on the altar.

138

The main function of the *sphageion*, I would suggest, was to collect the blood for future use, i.e., to be prepared in some way, so that it could be eaten. When an animal is slaughtered and the blood is to be kept and subsequently used for food, it is standard procedure to whip the blood carefully to prevent it from coagulating.

139

After the blood has been whipped for about 30 minutes to one hour while it cools down, there is no longer any risk of coagulation and at the same time flour and seasoning may be added. A large vessel, such as the *sphageion*, would serve such a purpose excellently.

69

Some of the vase-paintings depicting the meat being cut up and prepared for dining show a *sphageion* centrally placed under the table on top of which the dead animal is lying (Fig. 8–9).

140

If the *sphageion* was used only for holding the blood temporarily before it was poured out, it seems strange that the vessel should occupy such a prominent place in the vase-paintings, particularly in those scenes showing the cutting up of the meat. Rather, the *sphageia* filled with blood are to be considered as being left to the *mageiroi* (butchers) for them to prepare the blood in a suitable manner after having taken care of the meat. The blood had to be taken care of quite quickly, since it was easily spoilt.



Fig. 9. *Mageiros* preparing the meat for consumption. The *sphageion* is placed under the table on top of which the animal is being cut up. Note the blood that has spilled over the sides of the *sphageion*. Athenian red-figure lekythos, c. 475–450 BC, Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptotek.

additional support from the use of this vessel at the sacrifice of a wineskin described by Aristophanes.

141

The wineskin/child is to be slaughtered, ἀποσφαγήσεται, and the mother calls for the *sphageion*, so that she will at least be able to keep the “blood”. Of course, in this case the “blood” is wine and perfectly consumable, but, had the *sphageion* not generally been used to keep the blood from the sacrificial victims for future consumption, Aristophanes’ play on the terminology would have been unintelligible.

2.2. Evidence for food made with blood

71

The ancient Greek sources are not very explicit on the use of blood. However, there is no indication of a rule stipulating that, after some blood had been used for splashing on the altar, the rest had to be poured out, since it belonged to the gods or was considered as unfit for consumption. There are a number of clear cases of the blood being kept and eaten. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus’ twisting and turning in his bed is compared to that of a man grilling a stomach filled with fat and blood (κνίσης τε καὶ αἵματος) over the fire, turning it over and over to make sure that it is evenly cooked.

142

Another example is to be found in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (122–123). The god slaughters two of Apollo’s cows and roasts the meat, as well as the bowels filled with blood, μέλαν αἶμα ἐργμένον ἐν χολάδεσσι, a kind of blood sausage. The term αἱμάτιον, also meaning blood sausage, is found in inscriptions among the parts to be distributed after a sacrifice.

143

The 4th-century BC comedian Sophilos also speaks of a blood sausage, αἱματίτης χορδή.

144

Blood seems to have been used for the Spartan black broth, ζωμὸς μέλας, since another term for this soup was αἱματία.

145

Another dish, called *myma*, was prepared with meat and blood. The tender parts of the meat were cut up and mixed with the intestines,

blood, cheese, various kinds of onions and a number of spices and herbs.

146

Hyposphagma was the name of a black-pudding, made of blood mixed with various other ingredients.

147

Later sources indicate that blood could be used when *garum* was manufactured.

148

72

Thus, it was not forbidden to eat the blood. However, if blood was eaten on a regular basis, why are there not more mentions of food prepared with blood or blood being kept to be eaten? The most plausible answer is that blood products were not considered to be the most prestigious kind of food, especially if compared with the meat. Food prepared from animal blood was probably seen as more of a poor man's diet and was not eaten by those who could afford better. The fact that the Spartans used blood in their frugal alimentary regime agrees well with blood being a simple kind of nourishment. The ideal fare in the ancient Greek world was meat, grilled meat, the kind of diet most strongly emphasized in the Homeric poems.

149

73

Secondly, blood must be treated before it can be eaten. Sausages could probably be manufactured on the spot by pouring the whipped and seasoned blood into the intestines that had been cleaned out and then grilling them over the fire, in the same manner as referred to in Homer and the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* mentioned above.

150

A bronze vessel for preparing sausages, γαστρόπτης, is mentioned among the dining equipment in the Delian inscriptions.

151

More likely, the sausages were first cooked in water, to preserve the blood, and later fried or grilled, just like the French *boudin noir*.

152

The preparation of blood sausages takes a longer time than the direct grilling of the *splanchna*, or the cooking of the meat, and therefore belongs to the aftermath of the sacrifice, which rarely is described in the sources.

74

Apart from the direct instances of preparation of the blood mentioned above, one could argue from the point of view of practicality. Since, at a regular *thysia*, everything in the animal was eaten except the parts which could not be digested by man, such as the bones, the fat, the bile and the hide, it seems highly unlikely that the blood would have been discarded, since it is both nutritious and contains valuable minerals, especially iron.

153

75

Moreover, if all the blood was to be poured out on, at, around or near the altar, one would have expected regulations stipulating where this could be done, just as there were regulations stipulating where various kinds of dung and ashes could be disposed of.

154

This, however, is not the case. Considering the amount of blood that had to be disposed of at each sacrifice, it seems unlikely that the blood was simply discarded on the ground.

155

76

Matters would have been different, had there been a ritual prohibition against eating blood, but there is no trace of such a rule in the Greek contexts.

156

In this respect, there is a fundamental difference between the Greek ritual practices and the Israelite ones, in spite of the fact that many similarities can be found between these two cultures regarding the way in which the sacrifices were performed.

157

At the Israelite sacrifices, it was forbidden to eat the blood, since it belonged to God and contained the life of the animal sacrificed.

158

It could be collected in a particular vessel and used for ritual purposes, but in the end it was all poured out, usually over the altar.

77

The Israelite practice of not eating the blood was transferred to the Christian sphere. The Christian emperors of the 4th century AD forbade the bleeding of the altars, even though animal sacrifice seems to have been on the wane in pagan circles already during the 3rd century AD for financial reasons.

159

The Christian distaste for eating blood is particularly clear in a passage from Tertullianus' *Apology* (9.13–14). Here, the pagans are said to offer the Christians sausages of blood (*botulos cruore distentos*) just because they were perfectly aware of this kind of food being forbidden to eat for those belonging to the Christian faith. A formal prohibition against eating food made with blood was pronounced by the Byzantine emperor Leo VI (late 9th century AD), but even in the 12th century AD some sources claim that “foods made from blood” were still eaten.

160

Altogether, it is possible that the attitude to blood in the Judaeo-Christian culture has been allowed to influence the interpretation of the Greek evidence in modern times, which has led to the assumption that the blood was considered as unfit for consumption also at Greek sacrifices and that it was therefore poured out.

78

Considering the available evidence, however, it seems more likely that at regular *thysia* sacrifices the blood was kept and eaten after a small amount had been sprinkled on the altar. Finally, if all the blood was poured out, in one way or another, at regular *thysiai*, what would then have been the difference between that action and the blood libations and blood rituals covered by terms such as *haimakouria*, *sphage*, *sphagia*, *sphazein*, *sphagiazein*, *entoma* and *entemnein*? The existence of a particular terminology for the complete discarding of the blood can be taken as a further argument in favour of the conclusion that the blood was kept at sacrifices for which no such particular terminology was used.

161

To discard all the blood seems to have been an exceptional practice reserved for particular occasions.

2.3. Rituals at which the blood was not kept and eaten

79

Of interest here are the rituals focusing in particular on the blood of the animal victim, whether the meat of the animal was eaten or not after the blood ritual had been performed. Some of these rituals were

performed on a recurrent basis, while others were singular events triggered by the circumstances on a specific occasion. Apart from the blood rituals found in hero-cults, rituals of this kind are usually considered as having been used at purifications, oath-takings and battle-line sacrifices and at sacrifices to rivers, the sea and the winds, as well as in certain rituals for the dead, i.e., both in particular situations and to particular recipients.

162

80

Purification rituals were needed in a number of instances, the most urgent being death, especially after blood had been shed in murders, but purifications were also used as propitiations to avert hostile forces.

163

The actual means of accomplishing the purification varied: water, the burning of acrid-smelling substances, laurel, eggs and onions, but the most powerful kind of purification was brought about by blood.

164

It was used in purifying murderers, but also armies after mutinies and for cleansing temples and assemblies on a regular basis.

165

The animals preferred at these ceremonies were pigs or piglets. The fate of the animal, after the blood had been used, is often not indicated, but apparently it was usually considered unfit for consumption.

166

A major component in the purification sacrifices was to get rid of the matter used in the ritual by throwing it away, burying it or pouring it into the sea, and the animal victims seem often to have been completely burnt after the ceremony had been completed, since it was the blood that achieved the purification.

167

Though some gods, in particular, Apollon and Zeus, were connected with purifications, the actual purificatory sacrifices were not performed to these gods and often no specific divine recipient is mentioned in these contexts.

168

81

The second category of blood rituals was the sacrifices made when oaths were taken.

The blood was important in these instances, since it emphasized the gravity of the situation and also the fate of the oath-takers, should the oath be broken. The blood could be collected in a bowl or a shield and the oath-takers were to dip their hands or spears into it.

170

The animal could also be cut into pieces, on which the oath-taker was to stand.

171

In this latter instance the animal could not have been eaten and the same is probably also true for the animals of which only the blood was used.

172

When the oath was taken, divine figures were often invoked as witnesses, but the actual killing of the animal rarely seems to have been directed to a particular divinity.

173

82

Blood rituals occupied an important place among the sacrifices made in connection with war.

174

Most sacrifices performed in war seem to have been regular *thysiai* followed by dining, but, when the two armies were facing each other across the battlefield, *sphagia* were performed. At this kind of sacrifice, executed by a *mantis* and not a priest, no altar was used, no fire was lit and the animal was not even opened up for inspection of the intestines. It was simply killed and signs were probably read from how the blood flowed on the ground and the manner in which the dead body fell.

175

The war *sphagia* meant a destruction of the blood and the body of the animal was abandoned on the spot where it had been killed. It should be noted that also these sacrifices were, in most cases, not addressed to any supernatural figure.

176

What seems to have been of major importance was the performance of the act itself.

83

At the purifications, oath-takings and war *sphagia*, it was the situation that called for the blood rituals and a specific recipient was rarely

mentioned. Among the deities that were actual recipients of blood rituals are rivers and the sea.

177

For example, on Mykonos, the river Acheloios received an annual sacrifice of eight lambs slaughtered (*sphattetai*) so that the blood would flow into the river, while two more lambs and a full-grown sheep were killed at the *bomos*.

178

At this sacrifice, which formed part of the regular sacrificial calendar of the island, the meat of the victims may very well have been eaten.

179

Other sacrifices to rivers and the sea, at which the blood was emphasized, were performed in times of war, when the army had to cross over the water or on other occasions involving danger.

180

At these sacrifices, the blood of the animal was made to flow into the water and the victims seem to have been abandoned afterwards.

181

84

The blood rituals for rivers and the sea can be linked with the use of the same kind of practices to calm or receive favourable winds.

182

The winds could receive *thysia* sacrifices followed by dining and a number of *bomoi* dedicated to winds are known.

183

However, the blood rituals in the cult of the winds seem mainly to have been reserved for dealing with dangerous and threatening situations or to prevent the winds from damaging the crops.

184

85

Thus, it turns out that the contexts in which blood rituals were used mainly seem to concern situations that in some way differed from a regular *thysia*. The atmosphere in which these sacrifices were performed was characterized by some kind of threat or danger, and often also by a close connection with death. The war *sphagia* before battle and at crossings of water were the most extreme cases, but the purificatory rituals and the sacrifices at oath-takings were also particular situations. The aim of the blood rituals was to get rid of this danger or to prevent the unwanted from happening. In most cases, the animal was destroyed or discarded after the ritual had been

completed. The main focus, however, was the handling of the blood. The blood rituals are often not directed to any specific recipient: it is the actual execution of the sacrifices on a certain occasion that is of main interest. Also in those cases in which there was a named recipient, the blood rituals can often be connected with particular situations.

2.4. The use of blood rituals in the cult of the dead

86

Blood rituals are also considered to have been used in the cult of the dead.

185

This presupposes that animals must have been killed either in connection with the funeral or later, as a part of the ongoing tending of the grave and the dead. In the previous section on destruction sacrifices, it was argued that, even though animal sacrifice may have been practised in earlier periods, this ritual rarely formed a regular part of the cult of the dead in the Archaic and Classical periods, at least not in Attica.

87

Blood rituals for the dead seem to have been regarded as a practice of the past, which in historical times had been replaced by *choai* made of wine, water, milk, honey and oil.

186

The terminology used in the *Minos* points in that direction, when it is stated that it used to be the custom that victims were slaughtered before the dead were brought out, ἱερεῖά τε προσφράττοντες πρὸ τῆς ἐκφορᾶς τοῦ νεκροῦ.

187

88

Most evidence of blood rituals to the dead is found in epic and tragedy, i.e., pictured as taking place in mythical history, and it is questionable to what extent these practices should be taken as being relevant to the actual cult of the dead in the Archaic and Classical periods.

89

For example, Odysseus' slaughter of a black ram and a black ewe described in the *Odyssey* (10.504–540 and 11.23–50) can scarcely be

considered as reflecting any contemporaneous rituals performed to the dead.

188

Both the aim of the ritual, to approach a certain deceased person and to acquire information, and the context in which it is set, at the entrance to Hades, far away from society, argues against such an interpretation. Another passage often evoked in this context is the description of the sacrifice performed by Achilles at the funeral of Patroklos.

189

For the dinner preceding the burial, sheep, goats and boars were slaughtered and their blood flowed around Patroklos' bier.

190

At the actual interment, a number of sheep and oxen, four horses, two dogs and twelve young Trojans, were all slaughtered and burnt on the funeral pyre, hardly a ritual with parallels in the funerary practises in the historical period. In the tragedies, a number of passages mention sacrifices of blood to the dead. In the *Electra* of Euripides, Orestes visits his father's grave at night and offers his tears and some cut-off hair, as well as the blood of a black sheep.

191

Polyxena is to be killed on the tomb of Achilles at Troy and her blood sacrificed to his ghost, a sacrifice which her mother Hekabe thinks should rather be performed with an ox.

192

Eurystheus promises that he will protect Athens from his grave, but the Athenians are not to worship him and not to let *choai* and blood drip on his tomb.

193

90

The problem is, to what extent, if any, these passages from Homer and the tragedians can be said to reflect the contemporaneous rituals to the ordinary dead during historical times. In his study of popular religion in the Greek tragedies, Jon Mikalson has argued that the concept of the dead in these tragedies has little relevance to our knowledge of the attitude to the ordinary dead in the Classical period.

194

Even though the "literary" dead are ordinary dead in their own contexts, they cannot automatically be considered as corresponding to the ordinary dead in an actual contemporaneous context.

Moreover, some of the cases of blood rituals found in epic and tragedy concern human sacrifice, for example, the slaughter of the twelve Trojans at Patroklos' funeral pyre or of Polyxena at the tomb of Achilles, which further remove them from the sphere of contemporary funerary cult.

195

The use of sacrifices of blood, from either animal or human victims, to the dead in these contexts is perhaps best seen as a means of distinguishing these dead from the ordinary dead of the Classical period. In the mythical/epic past, blood was sacrificed to great men, such as Achilles, Agamemnon and Patroklos, but that was no longer the case in later periods.

196

Of great interest in this context is a 5th-century BC law from Ioulis on Keos regulating burial modes. This text, which has been discussed previously in connection with the *Destruction sacrifices*, stipulates that a *prosphagion* should be performed according to ancestral custom.

197

The *prosphagion* must have taken place before the burial and seems to have been some kind of animal sacrifice. The meat could not be eaten, since the family was still ritually impure, and was probably deposited in the grave or burnt with the corpse.

198

The term *prosphagion*, however, indicates that the blood of the victim was of importance at this ritual.

199

Most likely, the main purpose of the ritual was to provide the dead with the blood of the animal.

Another possibility would be to view the *prosphagion* as part of the purification of the family of the departed. A scholion on the passage in the *Minos*, which mentions the slaughter of an animal before the *ekphora*, states that there were particular women, *enchytistriai*, who purified the *enageis* and poured out the blood of the *hiereion*.

200

If the *prosphagion* is to be considered as connected with purifications, it made up only one part of the transformation of the family from impure to pure, since the house was purified the following day by

sea- and spring-water and soil.

201

94

Whatever was the purpose of the *prosphagion*, it seems to have been a rare ritual, which is documented only from Keos.

202

It was not practised in Attica in the Classical period.

203

Other funerary laws regulating the burial and the later activities at the tomb, just as the Keos law, do not mention any similar kind of ritual.

204

2.5. Blood rituals in hero-cults

95

The association between many of the blood rituals and sudden, violent death is apparent. Blood was emphasized in the sacrifices just before the armies were to begin the killing and blood was used to wash away the guilt caused by bloodshed. The spilling of blood is also prominent in the descriptions of human sacrifice. The representations of blood flowing in Greek art are limited to human sacrifice and war *sphagia*, situations far removed from the regular *thysia* and not followed by any consumption of the meat.

205

As a contrast, the killing and the bleeding at regular sacrifices are hardly ever shown in art and, apart from the splashing of some of the blood on the altar, blood did not occupy a prominent place in a *thysia*.

206

96

The blood rituals known from hero-cults should be considered against this background. On the general level, the rare use of blood rituals in hero-cults is in accordance with the infrequency of these kinds of rituals in Greek religion on the whole. The heroes are interesting, however, since they could be direct recipients of blood rituals, which was rarely the case with gods, apart from rivers, the sea and the winds.

97

If the cases of blood rituals documented in hero-cults are compared with the contexts outlined above, in which the blood of the sacrificial

animal was particularly important, there are three contexts that may be relevant to the understanding of blood rituals in hero-cults: war, purification and the sphere of the dead and the underworld.

98

Most of the heroes for whom blood rituals are documented have a connection with war.

207

The cult of Brasidas at Amphipolis consisted of a *thysia* sacrifice at which the blood of the victim was of particular importance, as indicated by the term *entemnein*, probably referring to a complete renunciation of the blood.

208

The connection of Brasidas with war is obvious: he was a general who had been killed in battle. The Amphipolitans regarded him as a founder of their city, but also as a saviour who gave his life in order to save them.

209

99

The war dead on Thasos, the *Agathoi*, constitute a close parallel to Brasidas.

210

These men killed in battle were subsequently honoured by the city, together with their families. The inscription recording these honours states that the polemarchs and the secretary of the council should record the names of the war dead among the *Agathoi* and that their fathers and children should be invited when the city performed the *entemnein* sacrifice to them. The text does not use any other term for the sacrifice, but since the fathers and children were invited to attend, the blood ritual is likely to have been followed by a banquet.

211

100

The sacrifices to the Hyakinthids in the *Erechtheus* of Euripides are set in the aftermath of a war and described by a terminology evoking war.

212

The daughters of Erechtheus have died in order to save the city at a time of war: one of them was sacrificed and the other two committed suicide.

213

When Athena describes the sacrifices the Hyakinthids are to receive

in the future, the relation to war is important. When war threatens, the Athenians are to perform a particular sacrifice, *protoma*, to the Hyakinthids and their sanctuary is to be a guarded *abaton*, which no enemy should be allowed to enter and sacrifice to secure victory. Their regular cult is to consist of *thysiai* sacrifices at which oxen are slaughtered and the blood shed in *sphagai*, blood rituals related to *sphagia*. Erechtheus himself, who was killed by Poseidon in connection with war, was to receive sacrifices called *phonai*, a term often used to describe bloodshed on the battlefield.

214

101

A connection with war can, admittedly, be demonstrated for many heroes, but I would suggest that in these cases this link was considered as being particularly essential and therefore may have affected the ritual practices. The use of blood rituals in these cults may have served as a reminiscence of the *sphagia*, the war sacrifices *par excellence*, but also of the shedding of blood taking place in war and the fact that the hero had fallen in battle or been killed as a consequence of war, which was the case of all these heroes.

215

102

It is important to note, however, that the blood rituals were not the only sacrifices performed to these heroes. The discarding of the blood, and perhaps also the killing of the animal in a particular fashion, only formed one part of a ritual which ended with dining. The use of the blood of the victim in hero-cults is thus different from that found in most of the other contexts in which blood rituals are documented. The blood rituals in hero-cults seem to have operated like the blood rituals in the sacrifices to the river Acheloios on Mykonos: the killing and bleeding of the animal were followed by the consumption of the rest.

216

The blood rituals to the heroes and to Acheloios are both institutionalized parts of the cults, performed on a regular basis, in contrast to purifications, oath-takings, pre-battle *sphagia* and the placating of waters and winds, for which the blood rituals constituted a response to a particular situation.

103

The blood rituals to the heroes should not be considered as being

proper war *sphagia*, but as modifications of regular *thysiai* by a specific handling of the blood, in order to recognize in ritual the fact that the recipients had specific connections with war. The *thysia* sacrifices, at which the blood rituals were performed, can, in fact, be considered as partial destruction sacrifices: the hero was given all of the blood, while the worshippers dined on the meat.

217

104

This kind of particular hero-sacrifice, a blood ritual followed by a *thysia* with dining to a hero with a war connection, is perhaps what is alluded to on a late-5th-century BC coin from Syracuse showing the hero Leukaspis (Fig. 10).

218

The hero is naked and in arms (helmet, spear and shield), charging to the right in front of a rectangular altar (to the left) and a dead ram lying on its back (to the right). The motif is remarkable, since sacrificial scenes are rarely depicted on Greek coins and within the Sicilian material such scenes are confined to divinities libating on altars.

219

It is therefore likely that the Leukaspis coin refers to a particular ritual. The presence of the altar excludes the possibility that the scene shown is a pre-battle *sphagia*, even though rams are clearly the preferred kind of animals in representations of war *sphagia*.

220

On the other hand, the dead ram lying on its back evokes a kind of sacrifice different from a regular *thysia*, at which the dead animal never seems to be shown, at least not lying by the altar.

221

Leukaspis was a local Sicanian or Sicilian, who was killed, together with a number of other military leaders, defending their territory against the invasion of Herakles. The story is told by Diodorus Siculus (4.23.5), who further adds that Leukaspis and the other generals received *heroikai timai* even in his time. The minting of the coin has been connected with the Sicilian victory over the Athenians in 415 BC, an occasion when it would be particularly suitable to worship a local hero connected with war.

222



(a)



(b)

Fig. 10. (a) Silver coin from Syracuse showing the hero Leukaspis, late 5th century BC, Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung. (b) Drawing of silver coin from Syracuse showing the hero Leukaspis, late 5th century BC. After Rizzo 1946, 215, fig. 47b.

105

The link between heroes, war and blood can be traced also in other cases, even though the individual passages do not necessarily reflect actual hero-cults.

223

Before a military undertaking, but not as a direct, pre-battle *sphagia*, heroes could receive blood rituals to secure their help, since they were intimately connected with the land that was to be invaded or defended, as was the case with the occasional *protoma* sacrifice to the Hyakinthids.

224

For example, before the Athenian invasion of Salamis, Solon secretly sailed to the island at night and performed a blood ritual, *entemnein sphagia*, to the heroes Periphemios and Kychreus.

225

Pelopidas was urged by Skedastos and his daughters to slaughter (*sphagiasai*) a virgin on their tombs to procure victory at Leuktra in 371 BC: he finally sacrificed a mare (*enetemon*).

226

The Cretan king Kydon was told by an oracle that, in order to defeat his enemies, he had to sacrifice (*sphagiasai*) a virgin to the heroes of the country.

227

The statement by the dying Oidipous in the *Oidipous at Kolonos*, that his body will lie hidden in the Athenian ground and drink the blood of the enemies killed in future conflicts between Athens and Thebes,

can also be interpreted along the same lines.

228

106

The worship of the war dead was spread all over the Greek territory, but in many cases it is not possible to ascertain whether blood rituals formed a regular part of the worship of all war dead, since there is no information on how the sacrifices were performed. For the *Agathoi* on Thasos, as well as for Brasidas at Amphipolis, a blood ritual was performed in connection with the *thysia*.

229

The sources that speak of the treatment of the war dead at Athens, on the other hand, tend to play down the religious element. From Thucydides' speech over the fallen Athenians, it can hardly be deduced that they received any kind of regular cult.

230

Other sources are more outspoken but use only the terms *timan* and *thysiai* in referring to the cult.

231

Sacrifices including animal victims and banqueting were certainly performed, but it is not known whether the blood of the victims was handled in any particular manner. However, it is interesting to note that the sources that speak of the funeral and cult of the Athenian war dead stress that they now had an immortal quality and received honours accordingly.

232

Perhaps the blood rituals are to be viewed as being more connected with heroes who had died in war, whose actual deaths were considered to be of central importance, for example, the Thasian *Agathoi* and Brasidas, while in the case of the Athenian war dead there was a wish to emphasize that, by dying, they had transcended death and had now reached an immortal state, being closer to the gods.

233

107

The second context of blood rituals which may be relevant to the understanding of the use of rituals of this kind in hero-cults is that of purification. Here, we enter into the question of what degree of impurity, if any, was ascribed to the heroes. Contact with the ordinary dead created pollution, particularly in connection with the burial, but also later visits to the grave could cause a certain

impurity.

234

The *prosphagion* sacrifice in the funerary regulation from Keos perhaps functioned as a purification of the family of the dead person and of those participating in the funeral.

235

108

The heroes and the tombs of the heroes, on the other hand, do not seem to have caused much pollution, since they could be located in sanctuaries, which were areas from which death and burials usually had to be kept away.

236

The evidence for heroes spreading pollution is scarce and seems mainly to have concerned those who were particularly sensitive. Two inscriptions from Kos, both dating to the first half of the 3rd century BC, stipulate that priestesses of Demeter, in order to keep their state of purity, should not step on or eat by a *heroon* (or from the sacrifices to heroes).

237

The sacred law from Kyrene contains a difficult passage that may be taken to mean either that the oikist Battos, the Tritopatores and Onymastos the Delphian could pollute anybody or only those who were “pure” or, on the contrary, Battos, the Tritopatores and Onymastos alone among the dead did not cause any pollution.

238

Pausanias states that anyone eating of the meat from the sacrifices to Pelops at Olympia cannot enter the temple of Zeus, a case which he parallels with the similar regulations for the cult of Telephos at Pergamon

239

Finally, the impure Tritopatores at Selinous received sacrifices “as the heroes”, but from this stipulation it does not automatically follow that all heroes were also impure

240

109

The way in which the hero died may be thought to be a cause of pollution and therefore purification. Violent and unjust death, such as murder, called for purification of the murderer by blood, but heroes who perished in this way do not seem to have been a source of any particular pollution. The war dead, who could be considered as

having died a violent death, were not considered as being impure, at least not in this period and there is no evidence for purifying the army after battle, only after mutiny

241

The mode of death seems to have been of importance, however, since to die with *kleos*, for example on the battlefield, did not turn one into a *biaiothanatos*

242

Moreover, the pre-battle *sphagia* do not seem to have been meant as a purification

243

A hero may be angry and revengeful at being violently killed and having died, but in those cases the sacrifices were aimed at placating the hero rather than at achieving purification

244

Sarah Johnston has recently suggested that purifications in general were more concerned with appeasing and averting the angry dead than has previously been recognized but she wavers on whether this view of purifications applies to heroes or not

245

110

The problem that still remains is to decide to what extent the heroes are to be considered as being impure. It seems doubtful that any of the rituals performed to heroes aimed at purifying the recipient. The use of *enagizein* sacrifices in hero-cults, for example, does not seem to have constituted a purification and is rather to be considered as a recognition of the dead state of some heroes and a certain impure quality (see above, pp. 237–239). The concept of impurity has been shown not to be fundamental to *agos*, but rather a consequence of the awesome character of the sacred

246

The *enagizein* sacrifice of a ram to Kalchas at Daunia before the consultation of his oracle, for example, may have been a purification, but of the consultant, not the divinity, and the consultant then slept in the skin of the ram.

247

On the whole, there is little evidence for the heroes spreading such kinds of pollution as would necessitate purification, and the blood rituals in hero-cults are best not connected with such a purpose.

248

Finally, a third context for blood rituals in hero-cults should be considered: the use of blood in the sphere of the dead and the underworld, particularly as a means of establishing contact.

249

To pour out the blood of a sacrificial victim, often in combination with evoking the recipient in question, seems to have been used as a means of getting his or her attention. The purposes for performing such rituals varied but in some cases it is an oracular function that was aimed at.

250

The clearest case is the sacrifice of blood to Teiresias in the *Nekyia* (*Od.* 11.23–43; 97–99), made in order to persuade the seer to give Odysseus instructions on his return to Ithaka. Odysseus slaughters and bleeds the victims into a pit and sits back to wait for the shade of Teiresias to come and drink, and thereafter provide the desired information. Similarly, before the consultation of the oracle of Trophonios at Lebadeia, a sacrifice was made in a *bothros* and Agamedes was called.

251

The term used for the sacrifice is *thyein*, but it is possible that the blood of the ram sacrificed went into the *bothros* by analogy with Odysseus' sacrifice in the *Nekyia* leading up to the consultation of Teiresias. Blood was also used for calling and contacting other beings of the underworld, such as Hekate and certain dead characters, in order to enquire about various matters.

252

112

In other cases, it was help and advice in a more general sense that was desired. At the killing of Polyxena on the tomb of Achilles Neoptolemos urges his dead father to come forward and drink her blood and to grant them a safe journey home.

253

To pour out blood for heroes as a preparation for war can also be seen as a way to approach them and secure their support. This may have been the intent of the *protoma* sacrifice to the daughters of Erechtheus, which, it was argued above, consisted of a libation of blood.

254

Possibly the sacrifice of blood to the *elasteros* in the Selinous

inscription may also have aimed at procuring the services of this being, although as a means of revenge.

255

Other cases can be found in the later sources.

256

113

The common nominator for the use of the blood in these rituals seems to have been to attract the attention of the recipients by means of the blood. In such cases in which the recipients were dead, the blood itself, to a certain extent, may also have revitalized those receiving it, giving them back some of the powers they had while still alive and thereby making them approachable.

257

This function is clearest in the case of Teiresias and the dead in the Homeric underworld. The ordinary dead cannot even speak before having drunk the blood and Teiresias can only prophecy after consuming this liquid. It is possible that the heroes were thought to have needed the blood to be invigorated as well, though it seems doubtful that they would have been considered as being as weak and feeble as the ordinary dead. Rather, in the case of the heroes, just as for the other divine beings of the underworld, the libation of blood created a connection and facilitated interaction between the recipients and the worshippers.

114

In hero-cults, however, an additional purpose can be suggested for the libation of the blood and the evoking of the hero: to serve as an invitation and an attempt to procure the hero's presence at the sacrifice and the following festival, such as athletic games and horse-races.

258

The *haimakouriai* to Pelops at Olympia can be seen as being part of a *theoxenia* ritual, at which the blood of the animal victim constituted the invitation to the hero to come and participate in the sacrifice and the festival, as an invited guest participates in a symposium.

259

The distinction between Pelops and a regular guest lies in the fact that Pelops is drinking blood, not wine. The sacrifices to Brasidas and the *Agathoi* on Thasos both contained blood rituals and were accompanied by games. There is no direct indication of the blood

being used as an invitation in these cases but it is possible that the blood was thought to function in a similar manner in these cults: to ensure the presence of the heroes.

260

115

Further examples of blood being used as an invitation to heroes to come and attend a sacrifice can be found in the post-Classical sources. In the *Aetia* of Kallimachos, the blood is clearly intended as an invitation to the dead founder of Zankle to come and participate in the rituals.

261

The magistrates invite the founder to the sacrifice (καλέουσιν ἐπ' ἔντομα). He is to come to the *dais* and he may bring two or more guests, since no small amount of the blood of an ox has been spilt (οὐκ ὀλίγως αἵμα βοῶς νέχυ[τ]αι). The blood sacrificed to the war dead at Plataiai described by Plutarch functions in a similar manner: an ox is slaughtered and the war dead are invited to the *deipnon* and the *haimakouria*.

262

Achilles was called at the sacrifices on his burial mound at Troy and, when a black bull was slaughtered (*esphatton*), Patroklos was also invited to the *dais* to make Achilles happy.

263

116

In the cases outlined here, the blood did not only serve as a means of getting the hero's attention, as an invitation and possibly as providing him with the necessary powers to execute certain functions. Of importance is also the view of the blood forming part of the offerings presented to the hero at a *dais* or *deipnon*, offerings which he consumed on this occasion, and he may have been perceived as participating in a symposium and drinking the blood. Pelops, for example, is described as reclining like a guest at a banquet, taking part in the offerings of blood. That the recipients were to drink the blood is also evident from the cases of Teiresias and Achilles.

264

117

In all, the use of blood rituals to attract attention and to render communication possible seems to have been restricted to heroes, the

divinities of the underworld and dead persons from the mythical and epic past described in the literary tradition.

265

Libations of blood, it was argued above, cannot be said to have formed part of the regular funerary cult in the Archaic and Classical periods. The ordinary dead do not seem to have been called, contacted or invited by means of blood and there is little evidence that there was any desire for that kind of closeness with the departed.

266

If the blood could function both as a way of getting into contact with the beings of the underworld and as a manner of revitalizing them and making them act, it is possible that such rituals were deliberately avoided in the cult of the ordinary dead, since, in the Archaic and Classical periods, they were beginning to be perceived as a threat.

267

Even though the departed could be manipulated and used for the purposes of the living, such activities seem to have been accomplished in a controlled manner, in which the living used the power of the dead but made no attempts to increase it.

268

118

To sum up, blood rituals in hero-cults seem to have had two possible functions, not mutually exclusive, however. On the one hand, the offerings of blood can be connected with the prominent link with war which some of the heroes had, who received these sacrifices. These heroes had either been directly killed in battle or suffered a death caused indirectly by the war. The sacrifice of the blood can have been a way of recognizing in ritual this particular character trait and served as a reminiscence of the battle-line *sphagia*. The use of blood rituals for heroes connected with war can be seen as a way of institutionalizing a ritual usually only performed in particular situations when the need arose.

119

On the other hand, the blood libations functioned as a means of calling and inviting the hero to come and participate in the festival, at which he was received as a divine guest and given the blood as a part of his entertainment. On these occasions, sacrifices, and often also games, took place. This use of the blood is more linked to the sphere of the underworld, as is evidenced from the literary sources,

even though it is doubtful whether such rituals were carried out for the contemporary ordinary dead.

2.6. The position of the head of the animal victim in blood rituals

120

Before concluding this section, a technical detail of the blood rituals should be briefly considered. Among the distinctions between Olympian and chthonian deities has often been mentioned a correlation between the location of the divinity and the direction in which the sacrifices were performed.

269

Olympian deities residing in the sky above received sacrifices aimed in that direction, while the chthonian deities below were given sacrifices going into the earth. In particular, the position of the head of the sacrificial victim, and therefore the direction of the blood streaming from it, have been considered to differ, depending on whether the recipient was regarded as belonging to the upper or to the lower sphere. At the sacrifices to heroes, who were dead and buried and classified as chthonian, the heads and throats of the animals have been thought to have been facing downwards when the animal was killed, so that the blood from the slit veins would soak into the ground and be of benefit to the hero.

270

121

Two points are of interest here. First of all, are the terms particularly connected with the blood of the victim, such as *haimakouria*, *sphagia* and *entemnein*, to be understood as covering not only the slaughtering of the animal and the complete discarding of the blood, but also more specifically the killing of the victim when the head was facing downwards, no matter who was the recipient of the sacrifice? Secondly, are all sacrifices to heroes, both the regular *thysia* and the blood rituals, to be considered as differing from the sacrifices to the gods, since the head of the animal was bent towards the ground when a sacrifice was performed to a hero?

122

Apart from the apparently obvious correlation between the direction

of the sacrifice, downwards, and the location of the recipients, below ground, we have to begin by looking at the extant evidence for bending the head of the animal towards the ground and its relation to hero-cults. The idea that the head was to be turned downwards is found most explicitly in two scholia, on the *Iliad* 1.459 and on the *Argonautica* 1.587 by Apollonios Rhodios, respectively.

123

The context of *Iliad* 1.459 is a sacrifice to Apollon by Kryseis, asking the god to stop the plague, since the priest has received his daughter back. In lines 458–459, after prayer and sprinkling of barley, the heads of the animals are drawn back, and the victims are killed, flayed and later prepared, i.e., a regular *thysia*.

271

In the scholia on line 1.459, it is stated that, when a sacrifice was performed to the gods, the throat of the victim was bent back, so that one turned towards heaven for the gods who lived there, while to the heroes, as to the departed, *entoma* were sacrificed towards the ground, while looking away.

272

124

The other scholion containing this information is on Apollonios Rhodios' *Argonautica* 1.587. The passage describes the Argonauts arriving at Magnesia, where the tomb of Dolops was located. Here, they performed a sacrifice to Dolops, ἔντομα μῆλων κείαν, a killing and bleeding of sheep and then burning them.

273

The scholion states that “*entoma* are *sphagia*, mainly the *enagismata* to the dead, at which the heads of the victims are cut off (*apotemnesthai*) towards the ground: this is the way to sacrifice (*thyein*) to the chthonians; to the heavenly ones they slaughter while turning the throat upwards”.

274

The scholion mentions the dead and the chthonian gods, but not the heroes.

125

To these two scholia can be added a passage in Plutarch concerning the sacrifice to the daughters of Skedasos, performed by Pelopidas before the battle at Leuktra in 371 BC.

275

On the night before the battle, Pelopidas had a dream, in which Skedastos and his daughters urged him to sacrifice his own daughter to procure victory. Pelopidas was greatly troubled, but the matter was finally resolved by sacrificing a young mare on the tomb of the maidens. In the Teubner edition, the text runs as follows ἐκ τούτου λαβόντες τὴν ἵππον ἐπὶ τοὺς τάφους ἤγον τῶν παρθένων, καὶ κατευξάμενοι καὶ καταστέψαντες ἐνέτεμον “they brought the mare to the tombs of the maidens and after having prayed and garlanded, they sacrificed her by slitting her throat”

276

Some scholars have advocated the alternative reading of *katastepsantes* as *καταστρέψαντες*, “after having turned down”.

277

In that case, this gesture preceded the slitting of the animal’s throat, meaning that the actual killing of the animal was performed when the victim had its head facing the ground.

126

Of relevance in this context is also Odysseus’ sacrifice in the *Nekyia*, in order to get in touch with the dead Teiresias. In book 10, Kirke instructs Odysseus to sacrifice a black sheep and a black ram and to turn the victims towards Erebos, while he himself look away (ὄϊν ἀρνειὸν ῥέξειν θῆλυν τε μέλαιναν εἰς Ἑρεβος στρέψας, αὐχος δ’ ἀπονόσφι τραπέσθαι).

278

In Odysseus’ own description of the event in book 11, he took the sheep and slaughtered them above the pit, perhaps by cutting off their heads, and the blood flowed freely (τα δέ μῆλα λαβὼν ἀπεδειροτόμησα ἐς βόθρον, ῥέε δ’ αἷμα κελαινεφές).

279

127

Only in these four instances can a correlation be found between particular recipients of blood rituals (the chthonian gods, heroes and the dead) and the position of the animal’s head. The connection with heroes is, in fact, made only in the scholion on the *Iliad* and in the alternative reading of the Plutarch passage. In all other cases of sacrifices to heroes, or rituals covered by terms particularly connected with the killing and bleeding of the victim, the bending down of the head of the animal remains an inference.

128

The next step is to examine the practical course of action when slaughtering an animal with the head bent towards the ground. It is clear from Casabona's study of *entemnein*, *entoma*, *sphagia temnein*, *sphazein* and *sphagiazein* that these terms often have a direct technical meaning, all concerning rituals in which the blood of the animal played an important part, and that there is also a certain overlap in the use of these terms for the same kinds of action.

280

The blood shed at these rituals was completely discarded and eventually soaked up by the ground, even though it may first have been used for a certain purpose, for example, at oath-takings, or poured out at a specific location.

129

Of particular interest among these blood rituals are the *sphagia* performed before battle, since there exists a small number of representations apparently showing this action.

281

It is striking that, on all these representations, no matter whether they are found on vases, reliefs or coins, the head of the animal is pulled up to expose the throat. The warrior or Nike who is about to kill the animal has straddled its back, holding the muzzle or the horns with one hand, while plunging, or being ready to plunge, the sword into the animal's throat with the other hand (Fig. 11). The throat is stretched out and has a vertical position: in some cases, the head is even pulled backwards.

282

Judging from these representations, the position of the head was not important, only the flow of the blood, which, of course, would go down into the ground.

283

If the main purpose of blood rituals was a complete renunciation of the blood, an exposure of the throat in this manner would also have facilitated the blood flow.



Fig. 11. *Sphagia* sacrifice in connection with war. Fragmentary Athenian red-figure kylix, c. 490–480 BC, Cleveland, Museum of Art.

Though it seems logical to bend the head of the animal towards the ground when sacrificing to those residing below, there is a practical problem: is it possible to slit the animal's throat when its head is facing downwards and its throat is not exposed? If the head of the animal is really bent towards the ground and the muzzle is pointing downwards, the access to the jugular veins is very restricted and it would seem almost impossible to cut the animal's throat. If, however, the victim is lifted up, so that the head and the throat are oriented in

a horizontal position, the throat can be pierced from below, as is shown on a black-figure amphora from Viterbo (Fig. 12).

284

Exactly what kind of sacrifice this scene is showing is difficult to be precise about, owing to its uniqueness, but there is no objection to considering it as being a regular *thysia*.

285


What should be noted on the Viterbo amphora is the presence of the *sphageion* to collect the blood, an object which is lacking in the depictions of war *sphagia*. The sacrifice shown on the Viterbo vase is not a sacrifice at which all the blood is to be spilt. Lifting animals up, in order to kill them at sacrifices, is mentioned in the written sources, but there is no indication of these rituals being anything other than regular *thysiai*, at which the lifting up of the animals was a demonstration of strength.

286

Thus, we are faced with a paradox: in the depictions of *sphagia*, at which all the blood was spilt, the throat is exposed and almost turned upwards, while at a *thysia*, at which the blood was collected and kept, the victim could occasionally be killed with the throat facing the ground.

287

There is no indication that the position of the head at these sacrifices had any bearing on the location of the divine recipient.



131

To conclude, the important action at the blood rituals must have been to steer the blood of the animal in a certain direction and eventually discard it all, rather than bending the head of the animal towards the ground at the moment of the killing. The action described in the *Odyssey* can also be interpreted along the same lines: first, Odysseus sacrificed the animals over the *bothros* by cutting their throats or, rather, by completely cutting off their heads, and then he turned the victims towards the ground, so that the blood would flow into the pit. To correlate the position of the head of the victim, when it was slaughtered, with the location of the recipient, as is done by the scholiasts on Homer and on Apollonios Rhodios, and in the alternative reading of the Plutarch passage, does not seem to fit the practicalities of Greek sacrifices in the Archaic and Classical periods.

132

It is possible that, apart from the cases in which the animal was lifted up, the head of the victim was always bent back to facilitate the killing, no matter which kind of ritual was being performed or who was the recipient. The distinction between a *thysia* and a blood ritual may rather have depended on whether the blood was to be saved or not, as well as on the technique employed at the actual killing. At a *thysia*, a knife was used for the killing,

288

perhaps only piercing the vein so that the blood could be collected and saved in a *sphageion* for future consumption. At the blood rituals, the throat was slit or cut, or the head may have been completely cut off, using a sword, at least for the *sphagia*,

289

and the blood was allowed to flow freely into the ground.

290

When the ritual took place at a *bothros*, the head of the animal, or the decapitated carcass, was surely held so that the blood would be directed down into the pit.

291

The sacrifice to the *elasteros* in the Selinous inscription being described as *θύεν ἡόσπερ τοῖς ἀθανάτοισι. σφαζέτο δ' ἐς γᾶν*

("sacrifice as to the immortals but slaughter the victim so that the blood flows into the ground") obviously shows that it was not self-evident where the blood was to go.

292

133

Furthermore, the notion that there was a particular action of bending the animal's head towards the ground when sacrificing to heroes, chthonian divinities and the dead is based only on information found in late literary sources and is perhaps best regarded as a literary construct with little bearing on the actual rituals performed.

293

134

Thus, there is no reason to suppose that all sacrifices to heroes, whether they were regular *thysiai* or contained a blood ritual, were executed by bending the head of the animal towards the ground during the killing, since this manoeuvre seems to be very hard to execute, unless the victim is lifted up. The majority of sacrifices to heroes were regular *thysiai*, at which the blood was kept and eaten along with the meat, and there was no interest in spilling all the blood. In the specific case of blood rituals, however, the blood was discarded and directed into the ground (or into a *bothros* dug into the hero's burial mound).

3. Theoxenia

3.1. Offerings of food in the cult of the gods and the cult of the dead

135

In the cult of the gods, offerings of food of the kind eaten by humans could take a variety of forms. Cakes, bread, pots of cooked grain and fruit could be deposited on altars, on particular sacred tables, at sacred places like caves and springs or before the images of the deities.

294

At the regular meals of men, the gods received an offering of a part of the food as a kind of *aparchai*.

295

Deipna (dinners) were offered to Hekate, for cathartic and apotropaic purposes, where three roads met.

296

Thysia sacrifices were regularly accompanied by the burning of grain and cakes, usually labelled *hiera*.

297

Among these food offerings, the ritual of *theoxenia* occupies a particular place, since the divine recipient was not only given food of the kind eaten by humans, but was also thought of as a guest, who was entertained and offered a table with a prepared meal and a couch to recline on.

298

136

The important role that *theoxenia* played in Greek religion has been made clear by several recent studies.

299

Theoxenia rituals have usually been considered as being used primarily for heroes or lesser gods, such as Herakles and the Dioskouroi, but it is evident that this kind of ritual was also practised in the cults of major gods, such as Apollon, Dionysos, Zeus and Athena.

300

The ritual seems to have been so widely practised that it cannot be tied to any particular kind of god and it is therefore not possible to explain *theoxenia* as a manifestation of the recipient's character.

301

137

When used in the cult of the gods, *theoxenia* could exist as a single action, comprising only vegetable offerings, and be of a relatively low cost. The ritual could also be a complement to a *thysia* at which animals were slaughtered and the offerings on the table in these cases included portions of cooked meat.

302

Moreover, *theoxenia* could be the climax or focus of a festival, at which other kinds of sacrifices were also performed, as was the case at the *Theoxenia* performed to Apollon at Delphi.

303

The offerings placed on the table seem regularly to have fallen to the priest, though the sources rarely elaborate on the fate of the offerings once they had been made.

Occasionally, the destruction of the gifts is stipulated, as in the sacred law from Selinous, which prescribes that offerings are to be taken and burnt from the cakes and meat placed on the tables for the pure Tritopatores and Zeus Meilichios, respectively.

305

138

The use of similar rituals in the cult of the dead is more difficult to grasp, as regards both their contents and the extent to which they were used. Though the term *theoxenia* is, of course, unsuitable for contexts involving the ordinary dead, it is of interest to see whether the dead were invited as guests and given a table and a couch, as were the heroes and the gods receiving *theoxenia*.

139

Food was among the offerings brought to the dead. At the burial, offerings of food could be burnt with the corpse or deposited in the grave.

306

These offerings probably comprised mainly vegetable materials, since the finding of animal bones is quite rare in funerary contexts.

307

Next to nothing is known of the contents of *ta trita* and *ta enata*, the ceremonies that followed on the third and the ninth day of the burial, but they probably consisted only of libations brought to the tomb.

308

The *perideipnon*, the meal which terminated the period of mourning and ritual impurity for the family of the departed, took place at home, and not at the grave and was a meal reserved for the living.

309

It was previously thought that the dead person participated in the *perideipnon* or even acted as its host,

310

but evidence for such a notion cannot be found before the Roman period, when the Greek customs had been influenced by Roman practices.

311

140

The annual ceremonies for the dead were performed at the grave by the family. The offerings seem mainly to have comprised various kinds of libations (wine, honey, oil, milk, water), as well as cakes,

flowers, fillets and, to a lesser extent, prepared food.

312

Offerings of food were also a part of the ceremonies performed on the third day of the Anthesteria, *Chytroi*, which was dedicated to the dead and on which a vegetable meal was cooked.

313

There is some disagreement as to whether the recipient of this meal, of which no humans ate, was Hermes or the dead, but the souls of the dead were at least thought to enter into the world of the living on this occasion.

314

However, they can hardly be thought of as having been invited, since various precautions were taken to deal with the presence of the dead and, at the end of the day, the souls were driven away.

315

The contents of the sacrifices performed at the other festivals of the dead, for example, the *Genesia*, are practically unknown.

316

141

Altogether; though food seems regularly to have been given to the ordinary dead, mainly in connection with the burial, there is no indication that the offering of food and the preparation of a meal fulfilled the same function as they did at the *theoxenia*, i.e., to demonstrate that the recipient was a welcome and honoured guest, who was invited and entertained.

317

The purpose of the food offerings in the cult of the dead is not clear, but it has often been suggested that they served as a means of providing the dead with sustenance and keeping them satisfied.

318

The idea that the ordinary dead were invited to a banquet and presented with a meal is to a large extent based on the interpretation of the so-called *Totenmahl* reliefs, which show a reclining male figure at a table laden with gifts.

319

These reliefs have now been demonstrated to be votary instead of funerary and showing banqueting heroes instead of the ordinary dead.

320

The banquet motif could occasionally be used on gravestones, but the

stelai bearing these reliefs belong mainly to the Hellenistic period.

321

Furthermore, no worshippers or servants bringing food are shown on any of the reliefs when used in a funerary context.

322

142

Another distinction between the use of food in the cult of the dead and at *theoxenia* concerns the handling of the offerings at the end of the ceremony. At *theoxenia*, the food was usually kept and eaten by the priest or the worshippers. The food offerings to the departed, on the contrary, do not seem to have been eaten by the family members and other mourners.

323

Instead, the offerings were destroyed by burning, judging from the usage of the terms *enagizein* and *enagismata* to describe the rituals, or simply deposited on the grave site.

324

At least, there are no direct indications of the family members dining at the grave at the funeral or at the subsequent visits, and the tombs of the ordinary dead were not equipped with dining-rooms for the dead, nor for the living, until the Hellenistic period.

325

3.2. The use and meaning of *theoxenia*

143

The meaning of *theoxenia* in Greek cult is debated. Its use in hero-cults has been explained as originating in the cult of the dead: after the ritual had been taken over into hero-cults, it later influenced also the cult of the gods.

326

Though the origin of the ritual may be impossible to trace, there are several arguments against such a development.

327

144

It is clear that offerings of food in the cult of the dead seem to have had a meaning different from that in hero-cults and the cult of the gods, since the dead do not seem to have been invited to receive the meal or considered to be guests in the sense that the heroes and the gods were. The dead were confined to an existence separate from the

living and in those cases in which they entered into the upper world, measures were taken to keep them at bay.

145

The view of the chronological spread of *theoxenia* from the dead to the heroes and finally to the gods is also complicated by the mention of what can be considered as an early precedent for *theoxenia* in Homer: Eumaios' sacrifice to the Nymphs and Hermes described in the *Odyssey*.

328

After having sacrificed the pig in what seems to have been more or less the regular *thysia* manner, Eumaios divides the grilled meat into seven portions and sets one portion aside for the Nymphs and Hermes.

329

A kind of *theoxenia* thus seems to have been used for gods already in the Archaic period.

146

Alternative approaches to the meaning of *theoxenia* are less concerned with the origins and focus instead on their function within the Greek sacrificial system, mainly in relation to *thysia*. The ritual has been seen as a cheaper version of sacrifice, as a means of modifying a *thysia* or as a way of marking a more intimate connection with the divinity.

147

Theoxenia without animal sacrifice could be simple indeed and therefore not expensive, like the meal consisting of cheese, barley cake, ripe olives and leeks offered to the Dioskouroi in the Athenian Prytaneion.

330

The cost of the *trapezai* in the sacrificial calendar from Marathon was only one drachma apiece, while the cheapest kind of animal victim, the piglet, cost three drachmas.

331

In this sense, a vegetable *trapeza* could be used as a less costly kind of sacrifice, in the same way as cakes and fruits were regularly deposited in sanctuaries.

148

It has also been suggested that the performance of *theoxenia* in connection with *thysia* was a way of increasing the god's share at the

sacrifice.

332

Apart from the inedible parts of the victim, the deity would receive a table with various vegetable offerings. On the table were also placed portions of cooked meat, which later were taken by the priest. A similar practice was the deposition of raw portions of meat, either on a table, on the altar or at statues. These portions, usually labelled *trapezomata*, also served as a means of increasing the god's part of the sacrifice but finally fell to the priest as well.

333

149

The use of *theoxenia* at *thysia* may also have been a way of underlining that sacrifice implied a division of an animal between the deity and the worshippers.

334

The preparation of the couch and the table with offerings, among which were included cooked parts of the animal victim, served as an accentuation of the god as the recipient of his part of the sacrifice.

150

The difference between *theoxenia* and *thysia* lies in the fact that, at the former, the divinity is presented with the same kind of food as that eaten by man. At a *thysia*, on the contrary, the deity receives his share of the sacrifice in the form of the smoke from the fire on the altar, a way in which it is impossible for humans to consume their food. Food eaten by humans represents the human side of the sacrifice and evokes the distant period when the gods still dined with ordinary men.

335

The ritual serves to emphasize that the relations between gods and men can be characterized by reciprocity and exchange.

336

Seen from this angle, *theoxenia* can be used as a means of illustrating various levels of proximity and distance between the divine recipients and the worshippers and therefore may modify a *thysia*.

337

3.3. *Theoxenia* in hero-cults

151

In the epigraphical and literary sources, there is no abundant

evidence for the occurrence of *theoxenia* in hero-cults. In most cases, the ritual is found together with *thysia* and functions as a complement to it.

338

The number of reliefs showing banqueting heroes, however, indicates that the ritual must have been more popular in hero-cults than appears from the written sources alone.

339

Occasionally, these reliefs could be used for gods, for example, Zeus Philios and Herakles, and, in later periods, also for the ordinary dead, but the clear majority concern hero-cults.

340

It is interesting to note that, though these reliefs demonstrate the popularity of *theoxenia* in hero-cults, a substantial number of them show not only the reclining hero and the table with food, but also a sacrificial victim (or, more rarely, victims) being led by the approaching worshippers. Of the about 100 banqueting hero-reliefs included in the study by van Straten, 76 show the worshippers bringing animals, while in 21 cases the worshippers are accompanied by a maid carrying a *kiste*.

341

The latter scenes must refer to the bringing of bloodless offerings, such as cakes.

342

This interpretation is supported by the fact that no altar is found in any of the reliefs showing the worshippers with the maid and the *kiste*, while at least 50 of the banqueting scenes with animals also show an altar. From this point of view, the banqueting hero-reliefs can be taken as evidence, not only for the frequency of *theoxenia* in hero-cult, but also for the combination of this ritual with regular *thysia*.

152

Jameson has noted that meat does not seem to be shown among the food lying on the tables on the reliefs.

343

However, on the vase-paintings depicting Herakles or Dionysos at *theoxenia* are shown long strips hanging from the tables, which probably represent meat unwound from the spits.

344

Apart from any purely technical difficulties in showing the meat

relating to the skill of the artists, an explanation of the lack of meat on tables on the reliefs could be sought in the relation in time between the various actions found in the reliefs. When animal sacrifice is alluded to in the reliefs, it is always the *pompe* leading up to the sacrifice that is shown, i.e., the situation before the animal has been killed. The reason for there being no meat on the table must be that, at this particular moment, there was still no meat available to put on the table, since the sacrificial victim was still alive. The reliefs thus show two different chronological stages: the worshippers bringing the animal and other gifts, and the hero reclining at the banquet.

345

The *thysia* alluded to must also have been performed to the hero and it seems safe to assume that cooked portions of meat would eventually end up on the hero's table. The epigraphical evidence shows that the preparation of the table usually took place after the sacrifice of the animal.

346

The order on the reliefs is the reverse, showing the hero already having been presented with his table, even though the animal sacrifice has not taken place. An explanation for this discrepancy is best sought in the standardization of the motif.

347

The most essential part of the relief was the banqueting hero and to this basic component could be added worshippers, with or without animal victims, as well as other attributes (weapons, horse, snake, dog, female companion, cup-bearer). Furthermore, since the reliefs, with very few exceptions, were private offerings and the sacrifice of an animal was a costly business for a family, there may have been a desire to clearly document the fact that the hero was being honoured with an animal sacrifice and not only the vegetable *theoxenia*.

348

The best way of showing the animal was at the *pompe*. The vase-paintings apparently show a later stage of the ritual, after the animal had been killed and when there was meat available. However, they are not entirely comparable with the reliefs, since the vase-paintings never show any human presence, only the divine recipients.

The financial aspect of the use of *theoxenia* is definitely one reason for

the popularity of this ritual in hero-cults. As a cheaper alternative to *thysia*, *theoxenia* were financially feasible for families who had less resources than, for example, groups of *orgeones* or other cult-associations.

349

In the inscriptions and the literary sources, which mainly give evidence for public cults, *theoxenia* to heroes are not very frequent, but considering the substantial number of banqueting hero-reliefs, which predominantly originate from private sacrifices, the ritual was very popular with heroes. Since families had less resources to perform animal sacrifice, *theoxenia* may have been the best solution. Also in the Athenian sacrificial calendars, it is often heroes of minor importance and, most of all, heroines that receive the *trapezai*, while the major heroes are honoured by animal sacrifice.

350

Public sacrifice was aimed at collective participation and therefore animal victims were necessary. In the private sphere, with fewer participants and less resources, *theoxenia* may have been more suitable.

154

The explanation of the use of *theoxenia* for heroes as to financial considerations is not valid in all contexts, however, since there were festivals such as the *Heroxeinia* on Thasos, which must have been a major state celebration for which funds were hardly lacking. Here, the fact that the hero was invited and entertained must have constituted the main feature and also the main purpose of the festival. No further details of the contents are known, but the ritual may very well have included animal sacrifice, as did the *Theoxenia* to Apollon at Delphi.

351

The view of *theoxenia* as a manner of approaching the deity, and bringing him closer, is therefore relevant to the understanding of the use of this ritual in hero-cults. This may have been true for all *theoxenia* rituals for heroes, especially since a substantial group of heroes were of a helpful kind concerned with healing.

352

155

The notion of inviting and entertaining the hero seems to have been at work also in those cults in which the blood of the animal victim

was poured out for the hero. It was argued earlier that one of the purposes of blood rituals in hero-cults was to call on the hero and procure his presence at the sacrifice and the festival. Pelops is portrayed by Pindar as reclining as an invited guest at Olympia, drinking blood instead of wine.

353

Also in the cults of Brasidas at Amphipolis and the *Agathoi* at Thasos, the blood may have served a similar purpose.

354

Later sources speak of heroes being invited to a *dais* or a *deipnon* and given the blood of the animal sacrificed.

355

The blood rituals can be said to make use of the concept of *theoxenia*, but in a modified way. First of all, even when blood could be eaten, it had first to be prepared. The blood presented to the hero was raw and differed from the food offerings usually comprising *theoxenia*.

356

Secondly, the blood was poured out and therefore destroyed, an action distinguishing these rituals from the practices of *theoxenia* in general, though other cases of the destruction of the offerings at *theoxenia* are known.

357

156

To use the blood of the victim in some hero-cults to achieve the same purpose as at *theoxenia* can also be linked with the use of blood to contact the beings of the underworld. This practice does not seem to have formed a regular part of the cult of the dead, but it is documented for the “literary” dead, for example, Achilles, Agamemnon and Teiresias, as well as in magical contexts, though mainly in later sources.

358

The blood may have activated the recipient and made him approachable, as is most evident in the case of Teiresias, who could prophesy only after he had drunk the blood.

359

It remains doubtful, however, whether the heroes were considered as being as weak and feeble as the ordinary dead and therefore in need of the blood to be invigorated.

360

157

To sum up, *theoxenia* in official hero-cults were mainly used as an elaboration of a *thysia*, just as in the cult of the gods. In the private sphere, the presentation of a table with offerings constituted a cheaper alternative to animal sacrifice, but also in private contexts the ritual could be used in connection with animal sacrifice.

158

There are a number of similarities between the function of *theoxenia* in hero-cults and the cult of the gods: the *theoxenia-heroxenia* terminology, the use of *trapezai* in the inscriptions for both heroes and gods, banqueting reliefs used for both groups, the food constituting the priest's share or being eaten by the worshippers after the ceremony. It is therefore possible that *theoxenia* may have originated in the cult of the gods, though the ritual seems to have been more frequently practised in hero-cults, partly on account of financial considerations.

159

The use of *theoxenia* to call the hero and induce him to attend the sacrifice seems to have had a particular application in hero-cults in the cases of blood rituals. Though the offering of meals to the heroes cannot be shown to have originated in the cult of the dead, it is possible that the pouring out of the animal victim's blood as both an invitation and the provision of a meal for the hero should be considered as belonging to the rituals connected with the beings of the underworld.

4. *Thysia* sacrifices followed by dining

4.1. Animal sacrifice ending with a meal

160

The fundamental role of *thysia* sacrifice, i.e., animal sacrifice followed by a communal meal, has always been recognized in the study of Greek religion.

361

This kind of sacrifice constituted the main ritual in the cult of the gods and formed the basis for the whole Greek sacrificial system, both on the official and on the private level. Work done on *thysia* in the last few decades, represented in particular by the studies by Walter

Burkert, on the one hand, and by Jean-Pierre Vernant and other French scholars, on the other, has approached the ritual from different angles. Burkert is mainly interested in the origin of the ritual, explaining its structure and function as deriving from the treatment of the animal by Palaeolithic hunters and its subsequent transformation by the Neolithic farmers.

362

The French structuralists aim at understanding the function of *thysia* within the Greek religious system, interpreting the ritual as serving as a marker for man's place in a larger context, defining his position in relation to the gods, on the one hand, and in relation to the wild animals, on the other.

363

Still, both approaches emphasize two central features of *thysia*: its collective nature and the consumption of meat by the worshippers. Furthermore, the ritual meant a separation between god and man, most clearly manifested in the division of the animal, resulting in the god's portion amounting to next to nothing, while man received the choice portions.

364

161

The eating aspect is considered as particularly important in the French model of *thysia*, in which the criteria distinguishing gods, men and animals determine what each group ate: gods enjoyed the smoke from the altar fire, man consumed the meat cooked in the company of his fellows, and animals ate their meat raw. Moreover, the gods' share of the sacrifice consisted only of the smoke, which was something ethereal and could not be destroyed or rot and therefore indicated their immortality. Men, on the other hand, ate the meat, which would putrefy if not consumed and thereby demonstrated their mortality.

365

No matter which approach to *thysia* is adopted, the importance of the various actions making up the ritual and the treatment of the different parts of the victim are fundamental: the consecration, the handling of the grains and the knife, the *chernips*, the killing, the sprinkling of the blood on the altar, the burning of the god's portion, the grilling of the *splanchna*, the libations and, finally, the division of and dining on the meat. It is difficult to imagine an animal sacrifice following this scheme being directed to an ordinary dead person, as a part of the funerary cult.

366

The dead may occasionally have been given animal victims, but the primary aim in those cases cannot have been the division of the animal between the recipient and the worshippers, as at a *thysia*.

367

Furthermore, the ordinary dead were impure and the consumption of an animal victim sacrificed to the dead would have resulted in the living also sharing this impurity and being contaminated with it.

368

In this respect, there was a difference between the sacrificial practices in the cult of the dead and in the cult of ancestors, even though these two groups may be difficult to separate. The ancestors were not directly identified with specific dead persons and the cult did not necessarily take place at actual graves.

369

The Tritopatores, for example, being some kind of collective ancestors, received sacrifices recognized in the official sacrificial calendars and the ritual consisted in regular *thysiai* followed by dining.

370

A late 4th to early 3rd-century BC inscription from Nakone, Sicily, clearly states that the ancestors and Homonoia were to receive a *hiereion* each annually and that the citizens were to feast with each other on this occasion.

The animals sacrificed to the dead are better considered as representing nourishment for the departed, as forming part of their belongings or as some kind of manifestation of the state of the mourners, perhaps connected with their impurity or grief. Animals sacrificed to gods in connection with the funeral, particularly at the end of the mourning period, are a different matter. These sacrifices seem to have been *thysiai* from which the meat was eaten.

372

Altogether, a *thysia* sacrifice, as regards both the content and the function, is a kind of ritual distinct from the cult of the dead and belonging to the cult of the gods.

Recent studies, based primarily on epigraphical or iconographical evidence, have even more clearly demonstrated the fundamental place of *thysia* among the Greek sacrificial practices and underlined its focus on collectivity and dining.

373

The importance of *thysia* sacrifices followed by dining is also evident from the lack of evidence for rituals of other kinds, particularly rituals in which little or no dining took place. Holocausts and sacrifices, at which a more substantial part of the victim was destroyed than at a *thysia*, can rarely be documented in the inscriptions and the literary sources.

374

Also the iconographical material is dominated by renderings of *thysia* followed by dining.

375

In his study of the images of animal sacrifice in the Archaic and Classical period, van Straten expresses some surprise at the lack of evidence for non-participatory sacrifices, particularly purificatory sacrifices, which were regularly performed at both public meeting-places and sanctuaries.

376

He excludes the existence of some sort of taboo on depicting destruction sacrifices and blood rituals, since a few cases are known, mainly battleline *sphagia* and one single holocaust.

377

Van Straten offers two possible explanations: non-participatory sacrifices may have given the vase-painters less scope for variety than sacrifices at which the meat was eaten, but it is also possible that scenes showing purification sacrifices, or destruction sacrifices in general, were only produced in small numbers and that by pure coincidence no such renderings have been preserved.

378

167

From the studies of representations of *thysia*, it is evident that the actual moment of killing is hardly ever shown, a fact usually interpreted as a wish to conceal the moment of death.

379

Recently, the concept of *Unschuldskomödie* has been challenged and it has been suggested that the killing was not depicted simply since it was not considered as being of great importance.

380

The fact that the clear majority of all representations connected with *thysia* show acts which are in one way or another connected with the meat of the animal and the dining aspects of this kind of sacrifice (the bringing of the victim, the burning of the god's portion and the grilling of the *splanchna*, the division of the meat) may rather be taken as an indication of the importance of these actions within this ritual than as an attempt to hide the fact that the animal was killed. Sarah Peirce, in her analysis of the *thysia* motif on Athenian vases, suggests that the abundance of scenes showing *thysia* should be related to the message in the depictions of this kind of sacrifice: the successful completion of the ritual and the subsequent dining.

381

Scenes related to non-eaten sacrifices belong to the entirely different sphere of battle and war, which is in fact shown, though rarely.

382

The killing of the animal refers only to death itself, nothing else, and it has even been suggested that such rituals focus exclusively on the slaughter itself and are not to be classified as sacrifices.

383

168

The absence of evidence is not automatically to be taken as proof of absence, but the scarcity of representations of sacrifices different from *thysia* followed by dining supports the notion of this kind of

ritual being performed most frequently and considered as the “normal” kind of sacrifice.

169

The widespread use of *thysia* sacrifices is related to their function both within society and within the religious system. Animal sacrifice followed by dining was a ritual intimately linked to the social structure of society and the communal sharing of the meat at these rituals seems to have been a central feature of ancient Greek society.

384

The collectivity is further emphasized by the meat being divided into equal portions and distributed by lot, indicating the equal positions of the citizens in relation to each other.

385

In order to participate in the sacrifices and receive and eat the meat, one had to be a citizen and the participation was therefore a sign of citizenship, since most sacrifices were not accessible to foreigners and slaves.

386

At the same time, it was the citizen's duty to take part in the sacrifices.

170

The universality of *thysia* stands in sharp contrast to the destruction sacrifices and blood rituals, which can never be considered as having been common, regular rituals aiming at collective participation but are rather to be connected with particular situations, recipients and festivals. These rituals resulted in little or no meat for the worshippers. At destruction sacrifices, all the meat, or at least a substantial quantity, was destroyed. The animals used at blood rituals were often burnt or disposed of in a way that left no meat, since the handling of the blood made up the ritual. Also at *theoxenia* rituals, the actual dining for the worshippers was not the main purpose, even though the offerings to the divinity could be eaten in the end, usually by the priest. In all, destruction sacrifices, blood rituals and *theoxenia* had a focus different from the collective participation and eating characterizing a *thysia*.

171

The centrality of *thysia* is further underlined by the fact that all the meat eaten by the Greeks seems to have come from sacrifices or from animals slaughtered in a religious manner.

It also seems that most, if not all, meat sold came from sacrificial animals, the only exception being meat acquired by hunting.

The notion of eating only meat which has been procured in a religious setting may seem strange to the modern mind but the fact that most cultures seem to have had, and still have, religious rules surrounding the killing of animals makes Western, Christian society rather the exception than the rule.

The important connection between animal sacrifice and the consumption of meat is further illustrated by the fact that the terms *thyein* and *thysia* were often used as meaning “to feast” or “feast” without any explicit mention of the sacrificial activity or a divine recipient of the sacrifice, even though such sacrifices must have had a recipient.

There seems not to have been any proper term in ancient Greek for the butchering of an animal in order to eat it, apart from *thyein*.

The frequency of sacrifices of this kind is also of interest. A recent study by Rosivach has shown that, in the Classical period, the ordinary Athenian male citizen could receive meat from state or deme sacrifices as often as every eighth or ninth day and he suggests that this meat distribution formed a substantial part of the protein intake in the diet.

As far as we can tell, meat was not frequently eaten in antiquity and this fact alone would decrease the incentive to destroy the animal. The aim of a *thysia* seems to have been to produce as much meat as possible for the participants, no matter what origin or function modern scholars have ascribed to the division of the animal between the deity and the worshippers. Moreover, it is interesting to note that the animals used for destruction sacrifices were small and cheap, i.e., usually piglets: if the destruction itself had been of central importance, more substantial victims would have been expected. Practical considerations were thus allowed to influence the sacrificial practices.

4.2. Sacrifices to heroes at which the victims were eaten

173

In looking at the use and function of *thysia* sacrifices followed by dining in hero-cults, there are two kinds of evidence to be considered. On the one hand, there are the direct references to the handling of meat and dining, in many instances covered by *thyein* or *thysia*, but often no comprehensive term is used for the sacrifice. On the other hand, there is a substantial number of cases for which no particular details are given as to how the sacrifice was performed. The terminology used for this latter category are also *thyein* and *thysia*, as well as various terms referring to honours being given, such as *timan* and *time*. Thus, there is a difference, as compared with the evidence for the destruction sacrifices, the blood rituals and the *theoxenia*. For the destruction sacrifices and the blood rituals, a particular terminology is used, dealing especially with the practical and technical sides of these rituals: the burning, the cutting and the bleeding. Also the evidence for the *theoxenia* is often more factual, mentioning *trapezai* or terms referring to the actual invitation of the hero.

174

In the review of the evidence in chapter II, it was argued that, apart from the cases in which dining is indisputable, animal sacrifice followed by consumption is the most likely interpretation, on circumstantial grounds, in a number of cases for which only *thyein*, *thysia* and the honouring of heroes are mentioned. Of interest here is why so many of the sacrifices to heroes do not contain any specific information on the ritual practices and what this fact can tell us about the place and function of hero-cults, as compared with the cult of the gods and the cult of the dead.

175

A survey of the terminology used for sacrifices to heroes shows that *thyein* and *thysia* are, in fact, the most frequently used terms to describe the rituals (Table 32). If the totality of the evidence for hero-cults is taken into account, the previous assumptions that *thyein* and *thysia* were rarely used in hero-cults and mainly occurred as a result of the ancient sources using the terminology in a sloppy manner or

not respecting the rules of the vocabulary are unfounded.

394

Furthermore, to consider *thyein* and *thysia* as referring only to sacrifices to the immortal gods of heaven, and as a sign of Olympian cult has been demonstrated as all too schematic by Casabona's careful investigation of the use and meaning of these terms. According to Casabona, *thyein* and *thysia* have a flexible use that can encompass all the different kinds of contexts, which have often been viewed by previous scholars as more or less incompatible.

395

He underlines that the understanding of the terms in all cases depends on the contexts in which they are found.

Table 32. Terms used for sacrifices to heroes in the epigraphical and literary sources from the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods.

Term or equivalent	Number of instances
<i>Holokautos</i>	4
<i>Enagizein, enagisma</i>	4
<i>Sphagai</i>	1
<i>Protoma</i>	1
<i>Entemnein</i>	2
<i>Haimakouriai</i>	1
<i>Phonai</i>	1
<i>Trapeza</i>	12
Various expressions relating to <i>theoxenia</i> (<i>heroxeinia, aparchai</i> , prepared food)	9
<i>Thyein</i>	22
<i>Thysia</i>	20
<i>Bouthytot</i>	1
<i>Polythytot</i>	1
Other terms (<i>orgiazein, therapeia, apopempein</i>)	3
Terms referring to honouring	15
No term given, but animal sacrifice followed by dining evident from context	34

176

Casabona does not comment in particular on hero-cults or on the implications of his interpretation of *thyein* and *thysia* for the view of the sacrificial rituals of hero-cults. There is, however, no reason why it cannot be fully applied to the evidence for the sacrifices to heroes as well. If we look at the use and meaning of *thyein* and *thysia* as terms for Greek sacrifices, they refer most frequently, according to Casabona, to the whole sacrificial ceremony, comprising both the consecration (*katarchesthai*) and the killing of the victim (*sphazein*), as well as the pouring of libations (*spendein*). These sacrifices ended with a meal for the worshippers and, when no particular details are given which can help to clarify the contents of the rituals, the most common meaning of the terms is to be assumed, i.e., a sacrifice in a positive atmosphere concluding with a banquet for the participants.

396

The majority of all Greek animal sacrifices were of this kind.

177

As has been shown above, there are a number of sacrifices to heroes in which the details given show beyond dispute that the terms refer to sacrifices followed by ritual dining. More importantly, also when there are no particulars given it is, in fact, possible to interpret *thyein* and *thysia* as covering the same kind of sacrifice. Most obvious is the use of the terms in the sacrificial calendars. In the calendar of the Salaminioi, for example, all the sacrifices are summarized *θύεν δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσιν*.

397

In the subsequent listing of the individual recipients and their sacrifices, one sacrifice is further specified: the holocaust to Ioleos. In this case, *thyein* must be considered to carry the general meaning “to sacrifice” and, unless otherwise specified, “to sacrifice and eat”. Therefore, all the sacrifices in the Salaminioi calendar, both those to the gods and those to the heroes, are to be interpreted as followed by dining, apart from one case. The exceptional sacrifice deviating from this norm and having a different ritual is explicitly pointed out and indicated as a holocaust.

178

Casabona further stresses that, owing to the general meaning, *thyein*

and *thysia* could also be used to describe sacrifices with widely different aims and directed to all kinds of divinities, a group that also includes the heroes.

398

This extended usage means that *thyein* and *thysia* could cover sacrifices which did not include any dining on the meat from the victim, such as purifications and apotropaic rituals (incidentally, none of the two examples given by Casabona involve animal victims). The most evident case of this use is *thyein* and *thysia* as referring to human sacrifices, which of course would not be followed by a meal.

399

Casabona makes it clear, however, that the usage of *thyein* and *thysia* for sacrifices not followed by consumption is rare, no matter the context, and that these rituals are generally covered by their own particular terminology, which is more concerned with the purely technical aspects of the sacrifices than *thyein* and *thysia*. From the evidence which has been discussed here, it is clear that this is the case also in hero-cults, in which the blood rituals are described by terms such as *entemnein*, *haimakouriai*, *sphagai*, *protoma* and *phonai* and the destruction sacrifices are covered by *holokautos*, *enagizein* and *enagisma*.

179

Even though Casabona does not explicitly say so, there is, however, no support for the notion that, when found in the cult of heroes, *thyein* and *thysia* were used in such general senses that they had no bearing on the ritual contents, i.e., the ritual could very well be a holocaust, even when *thyein* and *thysia* were used.

400

There is, in fact, not one single instance of *thyein* or *thysia* in hero-cult which can be demonstrated as referring directly to a specific, complete, destruction sacrifice in the same sense as terms such as *enagizein* or *holokautos*.

401

On the other hand, there are a number of cases in which the general use of the terms can be shown to cover a sacrifice followed by dining.

180

If the preconceived notions concerning how sacrifices to heroes were performed are discarded and all the relevant evidence is considered, there is, in fact, no objection to interpreting all unspecified contexts

as being sacrifices at which the worshippers ate. It is of interest here to consider briefly the origin of the notion that the main ritual used in hero-cults was a sacrifice that clearly differed from the cult of the gods and that it left no meat for the worshippers to dine on. This notion is firmly established in the late 19th and early 20th century handbooks on Greek religion, but it can be traced even further back. As early as in Creuzer's *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker*, which appeared in its third edition in 1842, and in Hermann's *Lehrbuch der gottesdienstlichen Alterthümer der Griechen* from 1846 the regular hero worship is presented as a kind of funerary cult or the worship of the dead, clearly distinguished from the cult of the gods, in particular when it comes to the terminology.

402

All the assumed characteristics of hero-cults are present here: the low altar called *eschara*, the blood poured into a pit, the head of the victim being bent towards the ground, the ritual actions covered by *enagismos*, *enagismata* and *entoma*, occasionally interrupted by *thyein*. However, the evidence supporting this characterization of hero-cults consists of a mixture of sources. With few exceptions, these sources are post-Classical and most of them are of Roman date: Diogenes Laertios, Ammonios, Pausanias, Plutarch, Philostratos, Athenaios, Porphyrios, as well as the late-2nd-century AD inscription recording Juventianus' restoration of the Palaimonion at Isthmia. The explicatory sources also occur frequently: the *Etymologicum Magnum*, Eustathius, Pollux, Apollonios' *Lexicon Homericum* and scholia to the *Iliad*, Euripides' *Phoenician women*, Pindar and Apollonios Rhodios. Apart from the fact that all of these texts are late works, it can, in many cases, be demonstrated that they both reflect and are influenced by their own contemporary contexts, which are not necessarily applicable to the conditions during earlier periods.

403

The only Archaic-Classical source used by Creuzer and Hermann to demonstrate the particular characteristics of hero-cults is Herodotos' account of the cult of Herakles on Thasos, contrasting *thyein* and *enagizein*, a passage which, as has been shown above, cannot be said to be generic for the sacrificial practices in hero-cults.

404

century onwards, the understanding of the sacrificial rituals of hero-cults in the Archaic and Classical periods has not been based on the contemporaneous evidence. Instead, a selection of sources has been made, an approach perhaps emanating from the belief that these texts (and the occasional inscription) were representative for the general situation of all periods. It is evident that a comprehensive evaluation of the sources from a limited time span has not been aimed at in any case. When the entire material is taken into account, as has been attempted in this study, it is clear that the evidence making up the foundations of the traditional notion of hero-cults cannot be regarded as being representative. Furthermore, when these texts are put into their respective chronological context it is even more apparent that they do not present an accurate picture of the sacrificial rituals of the hero-cults in the Archaic and Classical periods. Most importantly, the traditional notion of hero-cults as distinct from the cult of the gods cannot be substantiated. From this follows that there is no support for the assumption that *thyein* and *thysia* in hero-cults can and should be interpreted as an unspecified use referring to destruction sacrifices, since such rituals were characteristic of hero-cults.

182

In all, it can be argued that *thyein* and *thysia* had the same function in both hero-cults and the cult of the gods. The difficulties in accepting that *thyein* and *thysia* in hero-cults refer to animal sacrifice followed by a meal for the worshippers, unless when explicitly stated, rests on the assumption that it was forbidden to eat of the meat from the victims sacrificed to the heroes. The lack of evidence for destruction sacrifices and rituals focusing on the blood of the victim, as well as the frequent combination of *theoxenia* with *thysia*, does not support such a notion. The hesitation to recognize the dominance of alimentary sacrifices in hero-cults and to interpret also unspecified instances of *thyein*, *thysia* and other general terms as referring to this kind of ritual has also originated in the belief that heroes received their sacrifices on *escharai* and in *bothroi*. As has been demonstrated above, these terms have little or no relevance to sacrifices to heroes in the Archaic and Classical periods. When an altar is mentioned in a hero-cult, it is called *bomos*, a fact which has been more or less overlooked.

An alternative approach to the common use of *thyein* and *thysia* in hero-cults has been to view the choice of the terms as a deliberate attempt to indicate that in a few instances, the recipients were not regarded as chthonian and dead, but as Olympian and immortal and therefore receiving sacrifices concluded by dining.

406

From this follows, that in the majority of the instances, the sacrifices could still have been different from the cult of the gods. However, this explanation is also based on the assumption that the heroes were chthonian and that their character automatically resulted in certain rituals. The use of the terms in this manner is not supported by Casabona's study of *thyein* and *thysia*. More importantly, this belief is invalidated by the direct evidence for dining in hero-cults being more substantial than the evidence for the destruction sacrifices and blood rituals. If all the unspecified instances of sacrifices to heroes are excluded and only the cases which can definitely be considered as being either holocausts, blood rituals or centred on ritual dining are taken into account, *thysia* sacrifices at which the worshippers ate are still more frequent than rituals resulting in the destruction of the animal victim.

The majority of all sacrifices to heroes are not specified in any way, i.e., no particular term is given or the terminology consists of *thyein*, *thysia* or terms referring to honours (see Table 32, p. 294). The lack of information for so many of the sacrifices to heroes is, in itself, relevant, since it is the unusual practices deviating from the norm that have to be specified and pointed out, not the regular behaviour known to all.

407

From the study of the evidence for destruction sacrifices, blood rituals and *theoxenia* carried out above, it was clear that particular comments or details concerning the sacrifices almost exclusively concern the parts of the animal falling to the worshippers. Any behaviour resulting in less or no meat to be eaten, a total discarding of the blood, restrictions as to where the dining was to take place, as well as a handling or division of the meat diverging from the ordinary, was in need of elucidation. Unspecified sacrifices to heroes

can thus be interpreted as being *thysia* followed by dining.

185

Furthermore, if we assume that destruction sacrifices and blood rituals were common in hero-cults, we have to presume that a number of cases refer to such sacrifices, even though no particular term for the sacrifice is used or just *thyein*, *thysia* or a term referring to honours. Still, it is impossible to define which of these unspecified sacrifices are to be interpreted as holocausts or blood rituals. The specification of a sacrifice as ὥς ἥρω does not offer any guidance, since this addition seems not to have had any bearing on the ritual content but to have served as a means of defining the ritual status of the recipient.

186

If every unspecified sacrifice to a hero (whether or not covered by *thyein* or *thysia*) is to be taken as being either a destruction sacrifice or a sacrifice ending with dining but modified by a partial destruction of the meat or by a particular handling of the blood, it seems strange that this specific ritual is indicated in some instances but not in others. For example, the inscription from Thasos regulating the *entemnein* sacrifice to the war dead *Agathoi* can be compared with the rental contract of the *orgeones* of the hero Egretes mentioning his *thysia*.

408

In the latter case, it seems beyond doubt that dining took place, since the lease mentions the kitchen and dining-rooms. In the former inscription, dining also seems to have followed, but the sacrifice must have been performed in a different manner, since *entemnein* is used. Should we assume that the *orgeones* of Egretes also performed an *entemnein* ritual at the annual *thysia* to their hero? If the contexts of these two sacrifices are taken into consideration, this seems highly unlikely. The blood ritual to the *Agathoi* fits into the commemoration of those who had given their lives for their country, emphasising the grim origin of this cult and its connections with war. After the particular initiation of the sacrifice by this ritual, presumably by pouring the blood of the victims on the tomb of the *Agathoi*, there follows a *thysia* with a banquet. In the friendly and familiar, annual feasting in the sanctuary of Egretes, however, a blood ritual would seem out of place, since this cult did not carry with it any particular

connotations that needed to be recognized in ritual in this manner.

187

On the other hand, if we start from the opposite direction, namely the definite cases of holocausts and blood rituals, it is possible to argue that undefined cases are actually to be interpreted as regular *thysia* and that this kind of ritual was so self-evident that, in most cases, there was no need for any elaborations. Considering the importance of heroes in the Greek religious system, there is no reason why *thyein* and *thysia* should not have been used in the same manner in hero-cults as in the cult of the gods.

188

To sum up, the interpretation of *thyein* and *thysia*, of various terms covering religious honours and of contexts in which no particular term is used, as referring to rituals different from sacrifices ending with dining, rests on the assumption that holocausts, blood rituals and offerings of meals were the main rituals performed to heroes or at least that such rituals were frequent. There is, however, no support for such a notion, either in the terminology, or in the contexts in which sacrifices to heroes are found. If we approach the hero-cults on the assumption that the consumption of the animal victims was common, the opposite conclusion will be reached: the unspecified cases of *thyein* and *thysia* are to be interpreted as sacrifices at which the worshippers ate. This interpretation is in better accordance with the place occupied by the heroes in Greek religion at large. The dominance of *thysia* sacrifice followed by dining is clear, not only from the direct evidence, but also from the terminology, in particular, the use of *thyein* and *thysia*, and the fact that, in most cases, it was considered unnecessary to elaborate on the rituals. If all the evidence is taken into account, which has not been done previously, and not just the exceptional cases (exceptional as regards both the ritual content and the frequency), animal sacrifice with dining was the principal ritual. The evidence for hero-cults shows that heroes were worshipped on all levels of society and fulfilled the same role as the gods and therefore it is inconceivable that the unspecified cases did not refer to *thysia* with dining. The predominance of this kind of ritual further separates the heroes from the ordinary dead, since, unlike destruction sacrifices and blood rituals, *thysia* sacrifices had no connection with the sphere of the

dead.

Notes

1 In order provide such full contexts as possible for the four ritual categories also in the cult of the gods and the cult of the dead, material later than 300 BC will occasionally be included.

2 Deneken 1886–90; 2502; Thomsen 1909, 482; Stengel 1910, 138–145; Eitrem 1912, 1125; Stengel 1920, 141; Rohde 1925, 116; Meuli 1946, 194; Burkert 1985, 205.

3 Unusual: Scullion 1994, 115. Later deviations and influence from the cult of the gods: Foucart 1918, 101–106; Meuli 1946, 197; Nilsson 1967, 186–187. Disappearance: Stengel 1920, 141–142; Pfister 1909–12, 480–489. Terminological mistakes: Rohde 1925, 140, n. 15; Pfister 1909–12, 478–479.

4 Nock 1944, 590–591.

5 Jameson 1965, 162–163. See also Verbanck-Piérard 2000, 283–284, on the distinctions between *thysia* and *enagismata*.

6 Peirce 1993, 252 with n. 134.

7 Graf 1980, 209–221, esp. 220.

8 Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Burkert 1966, 103, n. 36.

9 A total destruction could also be accomplished by throwing the victim into the sea (*Il.* 19.267–268; Paus. 8.7.2; cf. *Hdt.* 1.165, sinking iron bars in the sea) or into a river or by simply leaving it on the ground where it had been killed, as must have been the case with the pre-battle *sphagia*, which will be further discussed below. The whole piglets deposited in the *megara* in the sanctuaries of Demeter are a different matter, since they were not completely destroyed. Their rotten remains were hauled up at the Thesmophoria, placed on the altars and spread on the fields to procure fertility see Burkert 1983, 256–259; Burkert 1985, 242–245; Detienne 1989b, 134–135. On the mystic piglets which were not eaten but deposited in the *megara* at the Mysteries at Eleusis, see Clinton 1988, 72–79.

10 The holocausts of bulls to Zeus and of horses to Helios performed by Kyros (*Xen. Cyr.* 8.3.24) have not been considered here, since they seem to be Persian rituals (cf. Casabona 1966, 164). On the burning of the tongues to Hermes from the victims sacrificed to other gods, a ritual which in fact does not seem to have been performed, see Kadletz 1981; Stengel 1910, 172–177.

11 *LS* 151 A, 32–34. This sacrifice must have been to Zeus Polieus (see Jameson 1965, 164–165; Scullion 1994, 82, n. 17) and not to Hestia Hetaireia, as Graf suggests (1980, 210).

12LS 151 A, 46–55. Scullion 1994, 85, suggests that LS 17 A b, 5–8 (= IG I3 241, 14–17, 5th century BC) refers to an Athenian case of a holocaust to Zeus Polieus, since the inscription mentions piglets, wood, *hiereia* and *kerykes*: the last-mentioned played a prominent part in the sacrifice to Zeus Polieus on Kos.

13LS 151 B, 10–21.

14 Daux 1983, 153, lines 13–15: Διὶ Πολιεῖ κριτὸν οἶν : χοῖραν κριτὸν ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ, χοῖρον ὠνητὸν ὀλόκαυτον, τῷ ἀκόλουθῶντι ἄριστον παρέχεν τὸν ἱερέα.

15 “The women acclaiming the god”, see Daux 1983, 154 and 171–174; Daux 1984, 152 and n. 28. “To Automenai”, see Parker 1987, 144.

16 Scullion 1998, 116–121, esp. 117. In his article from 1994 (p. 88, n. 33), Scullion agreed with Parker.

17LS 151 A, 32–34 and 46–55; C, 8–15. It is not entirely sure that the sacrifices are mentioned in the correct order on the stone.

18 The command τῷ ἀκολουθῶντι ἄριστον παρέχεν τὸν ἱερέα may, however, also be interpreted as meaning that the priest had to provide the attendant’s lunch from his own perquisites.

19 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 17–21; cf. Jameson 1994a, 43–44. The editors of the text take τῷ ἐν Εὐθυδάμῳ (line 17) to refer to a precinct belonging to an important, gentilitia group established by Euthydamos, whose cult of Zeus Melichios had become significant for the whole community (*idem*, 28–29 and 37). Clinton (1996, 165) suggests that Euthydamos was rather a local hero of Selinous, who had a precinct of Zeus Melichios in, or attached to, his sanctuary.

20 For the identification of the recipient, see Clinton 1996, 173. Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 64, identify the recipient as both Zeus Melichios and the Tritopatores (mentioned previously, A 9–16).

21 A 19–20: προθέμεν καὶ φολέαν καὶ τὰπὸ τᾶς τραπέζας : ἀπάργματα καὶ τούτῃα κα[τα]κᾶαι; cf. Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 38–39, 64 and 68. The thigh does not seem to have been placed on the table (see Jameson 1994a, 44).

22 The thigh was usually given as the perquisite of the priest; cf. Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 38 and 64. A decree regulating the relations between Argos, Knossos and Tylissos states that, when six full-grown rams were sacrificed to Machaneus, a leg of each victim was to be given to Hera (see Meiggs & Lewis 1988, no. 42, lines 29–31, c. 450 BC).

23 Hdt. 2.44. For the post-Classical, literary tradition of such sacrifices, see above, p. 127, n. 458.

24LS 151 C, 8–15.

25 For reconstructions of line 11, see LGS, vol. 1, no. 7, [θεῶι, ἰ] ἐρά; LS 151 C and Segre 1993, ED 140, [θεῶι ἐφ]ίερα. Presumably these extras were provided by the priest or some other official, such as the *hieropoioi* mentioned in lines 7–8. The cereal, the honey and the cheese may have been baked into cakes in the oven, before being sacrificed in the altar fire; cf. Stengel 1920, 42. The interpretation of

ἰνός (line 13) as lantern or lamp, suggested by *LSJ* s.v. and *LGS*, vol. 1, p. 29 seems less likely in this context. On the burning of *hiera*, see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 35–36.

26 *LSA* 42 A, 4–5: – – λαχάνων : [ο] ὑ [βρ] ὤσις; see commentary by Sokolowski.

27 An additional, later case of *enateuein* is found in a sacrificial calendar from Mykonos (c. 200 BC), prescribing such a sacrifice to Semele, *LS* 96, 23–24. The rest of the meat from the victim is likely to have been eaten, since it is stipulated that this sacrifice, unlike some other cases in the same calendar, should be accessible to the public, ἐπὶ το(ῦ)τ[ο] πλῆθος. Three other victims listed in the same calendar are to have particular parts cut out (*koptetai*) but presumably not destroyed: the back and the shoulder blade of a ram to Poseidon Temenites (line 7), the back of a pregnant sheep to Demeter Chloe (line 12) and the back of a bull to Apollon Hekatombios (lines 30–31). Perhaps these parts constituted honorary portions; cf. Odysseus being given the back of the swine prepared by Eumaios (*Od.* 14.437–438).

28 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 11–12, commentary 31–32.

29 *LSS* 63, 5 = *IG* XII Suppl. 414, c. 450 BC; cf. Bergquist 1973, 65–90. The law also prohibits goats and piglets as sacrificial victims, the participation of women, the cutting of *gera* and contests. Bergquist (forthcoming) has convincingly argued that the whole ritual referred to was a normal *thysia* sacrifice followed by dining; see also Bergquist 1973, 65–90; Bonnet 1988, 359–360. Most other commentators, beginning with the editor Picard (1923, 241–274, esp. 252), have interpreted the law as a regulation for a holocaust, see for example, Seyrig 1927, 193–198; Scullion 2000, 166–167.

30 *IG* XII Suppl. 353, 10, late 4th or early 3rd century BC; Launey 1937, 380–409; cf. Bergquist 1973, 66–69. For the suggestion [οὐδ' ἐ]νατευθῆι see Bergquist (forthcoming). A small fragment of another Thasian inscription (c. 400–350 BC) may contain a third instance of the prohibition of *enateuein* sacrifices, [οὐ]δ' ἐνάτευεν, see Pouilloux 1954b, 82–85, no. 10a, line 1; cf. Bergquist 1973, 75; Bergquist (forthcoming).

31 Bergquist's re-study of the Thasian Herakleion (1973) has demonstrated that the alleged *bothros* rather was a well and the “temple” with an interior heroic *eschara* a regular *hestiatorion*, which was later extended to five banquet rooms; see also Bonnet 1988, 358–366. Furthermore, a recent analysis of the bones found in the Herakleion on Thasos shows that the animals sacrificed at that site must have been eaten (see Des Courtils, Gardeisen & Pariente 1996, 799–820, esp. 799–800).

32 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 9–12, translation by the editors. On the specification ἡόπερ τοῖς ἡερόεσι, see below, pp. 235–237.

33 A 15–16: πλάσματα καὶ ἡρᾶ ἀπαρξάμενοι, κατακαάντο; cf. Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 69.

34 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 29–30 and 53; Jameson 1994a, 44. North 1996, 299–301, suggests an outbreak of disease or a period of infertility as the cause of the impure state. Johnston 1999, 52–57, proposes sterility, since impurity may cause

this condition. See also Kernos 12, 1999, 234–235, no. 45.

35 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky (1993, 31, cf. 18–20) take κ«τ«κ«(έν (A 11–12) as referring explicitly to the burning of the ninth portion and καταγιζόντο (A 12) as concerning the burning of the usual parts, the *hiera*, at a regular animal sacrifice. Θυόντο θυμα (A 12) is taken to refer to the animal sacrifices considered so far, i.e., those to Zeus Eumenes, the Eumenides, Zeus Meilichios and the impure Tritopatores.

36 Even though mortals can pollute gods, it is the offenders who will suffer, not the divinity, see Parker 1983, 144–146. The parallels offered by the editors (Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 53) of the Selinous text are Orestes' sacrifice to the black and white goddesses near Megalopolis (Paus. 8.34.1–3) and the dual cult of Achilles at Troy (not Leuke, as stated on p. 53) described by Philostratos (*Her.* 53.8 and 53.11–13). In the first case, the goddesses change from black to white when Orestes bites off his finger: he then sacrifices to them both (see above, p. 111). The sacrifices to Achilles are directed to his two aspects as a mortal hero and an immortal god, respectively (*supra*, p. 99 and pp. 101–102). In none of these instances do the sacrifices result in any changes in the character of the recipient. Johnston 1999, 53–54, offers more compelling examples of deities being purified.

37 Clinton 1996, 163 and 172. He furthermore refutes the editors' interpretation of side A of the text as dealing with the purification needed in a particular instance and instead considers the text on side A as a regular sacrificial calendar arranged chronologically.

38 Clinton 1996, 170–171, takes θυόντο θυμα (line A 12) to refer to the sacrifice to the impure Tritopatores of a victim of unspecified type and argues that both καταμαίεν and καταγιζόντο concern the burning of the ninth part of this victim.

39 From the meat on the table presented to the pure Tritopatores, offerings were to be taken and burnt (A 15–16). This meat must come from the victim sacrificed to the pure Tritopatores. However, if the *impure* Tritopatores did not receive any victim of their own and the ninth portion burnt to them came from the two victims sacrificed to Zeus Eumenes, the Eumenides and Zeus Meilichios (A 8–9), the meat portion on the table for the *pure* Tritopatores could have been the second of the two ninth parts of the animals slaughtered to Zeus Eumenes, the Eumenides and Zeus Meilichios (Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 31, suggest that each of these two victims yielded a ninth part) and thus the counterpart to the first ninth part burnt whole to the *impure* Tritopatores.

40 The text speaks of τᾶν μοψᾶν (A 11), portions of meat from a sacrifice (Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 31). Whether the victim was that of Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides, of Zeus Meilichios or of the impure Tritopatores, the animal must first have been treated as at a regular *thysia*, i.e., the portion of the divinity was burnt, and then the meat was divided into nine parts, one of which was used for the holocaust.

- 41LS 18, col. III, 8–12, and col. IV, 8–12; cf. Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 18–19.
- 42LS 151D, 16–17; cf. Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 18–19. The goat sacrificed to the Charites on this occasion was apparently eaten after two portions (of the meat?), δύο θυῶναι had been burnt or just placed on the altar, see Pirenne-Delforge 1996, 210–212; cf. the commentary by Sokolowski to LS 151D.
- 43FGrHist 43 F 3 (ap. Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 694a–b).
- 44LS 18, col. III, 20–25.
- 45 Jameson 1965, 163; cf. Rudhardt 1958, 286–287. It was possible to take signs at sacrifices in which the animal was destroyed. In connection with war *sphagia*, signs were probably taken only by observing the flow of the blood and how the animal fell (Jameson 1991, 205, see also below, p. 252, n. 175). The inspection of entrails and the use of fire at *sphagia* are documented only in post-Classical sources (see Jameson 1991, 207–208; Henrichs 1981, 213–214).
- 46 Peek 1969, 38–39, no. 43, lines 2, 6, 23 and 26 = IG IV² 97; 3rd century BC. For the identification of the god as Asklepios, see Farnell 1921, 242; Robert F. 1939, 343–347; Roux 1961, 190; Petropoulou 1991, 30–31; Riethmüller 1999, 139.
- 47 A fragmentary regulation for a mystery cult at Phanagoria on the Black Sea, dated to the 1st or the 2nd century AD, also mentions a *holokautesis* (LS 89, 6). The term here seems to refer to the burning of parts of the animal victim, the rest of which was not destroyed, since the priest received the feet, the tongue and the hide (see commentary by Sokolowski on LS 89).
- 48 For the definition, see Scullion 1994, 90–92; Clinton 1996, 169, n. 39; Clinton 1992, 61–63; Burkert 1985, 199–203; OCD3 s.v. chthonian gods.
- 49 Scullion 1994, 93, 103 and 106–107; Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 95–97; cf. Burkert 1983, 136–143; Durand 1986, *passim*.
- 50 Scullion 1994, 110–111; Clinton 1996, 172; Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 107–114.
- 51 Scullion 1994, 110–112; Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 112.
- 52 Scullion 1994, 99–112, esp. 109.
- 53 Scullion 1994, 90–92 and 99; Petropoulou 1991, 29–31; Robert F. 1939, 343–347.
- 54 Cf. Verbanck-Piérard 1989, who criticizes the assumption that, for example, Herodotos' statement on the dual cult of Herakles at Thasos (2.44) should be considered as characteristic of his cult in general. See also Lévêque & Verbanck-Piérard 1992, 51–64; Verbanck-Piérard 1992; Bonnet 1988, 346–371; Woodford 1971, 213; Bergquist 1973; Bergquist (forthcoming). For the archaeological evidence, see *supra* p. 221, n. 31.
- 55 Edelstein & Edelstein 1945, 189 with n. 19, and 193 with n. 7, are sceptical about the existence of a chthonian cult to Asklepios; see also Verbanck-Piérard 2000, 281–332. Riethmüller's interpretation (1996, 1999) of both the tholos in the Asklepieion at Epidauros and the so-called *bothros* at the Asklepieion at Athens as used for holocausts and *enagismoi* of blood is based on the assumption of these rituals being common in his cult. On the *bothros* in the Athenian Asklepieion being a reservoir,

see Aleshire 1989, 26 with nn. 6 and 7; Verbanck-Piérard 2000, 329–332.

56 This sacrifice has been connected with a low altar, to the south of the temple of Asklepios, where the chthonian part of the cult of Asklepios has been located (see Robert F. 1939, 343–347; Petropoulou 1991, 30–31). For the remains of this altar, see Rupp 1974, 139–143, no. 46, who does not identify the recipient. Burford (1969, 48–51), on the other hand, suggests that the altar belonged to Apollon Pythios, on the basis of *IG IV*² 40, found in Building E to the east of the altar.

57 On religion and crisis management, see Burkert 1985, 264–268.

58 Scullion 1994, 81–89.

59 On the link between Zeus Polieus on Kos and the Dipoleia at Athens, see Scullion 1994, 84–86. Though the evidence for the Dipoleia is difficult to disentangle, it is clear that the festival was connected in some way with anxiety, solving problems and unusual contexts; see Durand 1986, 9–12 and 43–143, esp. 52–55; Scullion 1994, 84–89; Deubner 1969, 158–174; Burkert 1983, 136–143. Cf. also the comments by Rosivach (1994, 162–163) on the slaughter of working animals.

60 Nilsson 1906, 21–22, suggested that the original sacrifice to Zeus Machaneus consisted only of the three sheep: the holocaust of the piglet and the bull sacrifice were later additions. The meaning of Machaneus is uncertain; Cook 1940, 566, n. 2, suggested “Contriver” in the sense of “crafty”.

61 Stengel 1920, 136–138; Burkert 1985, 250–252.

62 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 56–61 and 131. For diseases or sterility as possible reasons for the creation of the inscription, see North 1996, 299 and Johnston 1999, 52–57.

63 See Burkert 1987, 44–46. A similar pattern is found in the scapegoat rituals: one person is chosen and expelled in order to save the community (see Bremmer 1983a, 299–320; Hughes 1991, 139–165).

64 Moreover, anything but a complete destruction would be impossible in the case of Boubrostis, since a sacrifice at which the worshippers ate (either a partial destruction sacrifice or a regular *thysia*) would imply that the worshippers shared their meal with “Hunger”. On the negative aspect of Boubrostis, see also Hom. *Il.* 24.532.

65 23.6–58, esp. 29–34 and 55–57, for the meal preceding the funeral and 23.166–177 for the sacrifice of sheep, oxen, four horses, two dogs and twelve, noble, young Trojans, all burnt on the funeral pyre, together with Patroklos’ corpse.

66 Burkert 1985, 193–194; Rohde 1925, 167; Nilsson 1906, 454; Nilsson 1967, 179–180; Garland 1985, 112–113.

67 Plut. *Vit. Sol.* 21.5; Ruschenbusch 1966, F 72c. The laws of Solon also ordered the mourning women to bring no more than one obol’s worth of food and drink to the tomb. This nourishment must have been intended as grave-gifts for the dead and not as a meal for the living at the grave side.

68 [Pl.] *Min.* οἷσις νόμοις ἐχρώμεθα πρὸ τοῦ περὶ τοὺς ἀποθανόντας, ἱερεῖά τε προσφάτ-τοντες πρὸ τῆς ἐμπορίας τοῦ νεκροῦ. Some of the other rituals

referred to in the same passage also seem to have fallen out of use at the time when the dialogue was written, see De Schutter 1996, 339.

69 Garland 1985, 113.

70 Van Straten 1995, *passim*. On the banquet reliefs (*Totenmahl* reliefs) carved on gravestones, persons bringing food and drink are never shown (see Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 65). This is in marked contrast to how commonly worshippers leading animals are found on the banquet reliefs dedicated to heroes (see van Straten 1995, 98–100 and 303–321, R115–R190).

71LS 97 A, 12–13 = IG XII:5 593: προσφαγίωι [χ]ρέσθαι, κατὰ τὰ π[άτριά].

72 Seaford 1994, 74–78; Toher 1991, 159–175.

73 See Hughes (forthcoming).

74 This is not entirely sure, since the entries in the Ioulis law (part A) do not follow in strict chronological order: lines 13–18 speak of the purification of the house taking place *after the burial*; lines 18–20 state that *at the funeral* the women have to leave the tomb before the men (or “not before the men”; see Seaford 1994, 77); lines 20–21 forbid the rituals on the thirtieth day *after the burial*; lines 21–29 mention rituals *when the deceased was still in the house*, as well as those who could enter the house *after the body had been brought to the tomb*. On the impure status of the mourners, see Parker 1983, 36–38.

75 If the *prosphagion* was performed by a person outside the family, who was untouched by the *miasma* stemming from the death, the sacrifice may have been a *thysia*, cf. the *enknisma* (Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 296f–297a) discussed by Hughes (forthcoming), which, however, took place after the funeral and as a conclusion of the period of mourning. However, *sphagion* usually refers to a sacrifice not followed by dining (see Casabona 1966, 187).

76 Cf. Houby-Nielsen 1996, 49, who has suggested that the vases in the offering-trenches at the Kerameikos were not gifts to the dead, but rather a material expression of the quality of the dead. See also Murray 1988, 249–250.

77 Houby-Nielsen 1996, 44–49, with n. 22: the identified bones are one sheep or goat thighbone, teeth, bird-bones and shells.

78 Houby-Nielsen 1996, 46–47.

79 Pfuhl 1903, 268–282. The bones in the graves come from the parts of the animals that would have been eaten: legs of lamb, sheep, goat, calf or cow, heads of sheep, ribs of pigs (268–269). Also the bones from the offering-pits are mainly long bones and skulls. It could not be deduced whether whole animals or only parts of animals had been burnt in the pits (273). No post-burial, burnt sacrifices could be proved (282). Cf. Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 215.

80 Young R.S. 1939, 19–20, graves XI, XII, XVIII and XX. In grave XI, an amphora with unbroken animal bones was recovered. None of the bone finds was identified as to species. The excavator interpreted the bones as evidence for animal sacrifice and the *perideipnon* taking place at the graves.

81 Cavanagh 1996, 668. The joints of meat come from sheep or goats and pigs, and

some were burnt on the pyre. The teeth are those of cattle, sheep or goats, pigs and dogs.

82 Cavanagh 1996, 674.

83 Blegen, Palmer & Young 1964, 17–18 and 84.

84 Carter 1998, 120–121 and 560–562.

85 Whole animal skeletons: Carter 1998, 560–562, T 62, mule; T 191, dog; T 316, horse; T 321, wolf. Astragaloi: Carter 1998, 560–562, T 186, 25 pieces; T 263, 8 pieces; T 264, 51 pieces; T 397, 3 pieces.

86 Food remains: Carter 1998, 120–121 and 560–562 (T 37, T 128, T 301, F 344 and T 347). Eggshells were also recovered from one tomb (T 218–13) and an olive pit from another burial (T 196–19).

87 Lyons 1996, 122–124 and 221–223 (T 50, T 51 and T 52).

88 To clarify matters, the practices during the Geometric period have to be studied, which is, of course, outside the scope of this study; see Hägg 1983, 192–193; Antonaccio 1995, 249, who interpret the animal bones found in connection with Geometric graves as the remains of meals rather than animal sacrifices. For the rare cases of food offerings shown on LG vases with funerary scenes, see Boardman 1966, 2; Himmelmann 1997, 15–16, n. 11.

89 On food offerings to the dead, see further below, pp. 278–280. In the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, animal sacrifice seems to have been performed in the cult of some dead, but none of the instances found in the epitaphs cited by Lattimore (1962, 126–127) is earlier than the 1st century BC. In the private cult foundations, beginning in the 3rd century BC, animal sacrifice, followed by dining, played an important role, for example, the foundation of Diomedon, Kos, c. 300–250 BC (LS 177 = Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 45; Sherwin-White 1977, 210–213); the foundation of Epikteta, Thera, 210–195 BC (LS 135 = IG XII:3 330 = Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 43); the foundation of Kritolaos, Aigale, Amorgos, late 2nd century BC (LSS 61 = IG XII:7 515 = Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 50); the foundation of Poseidonios, Halikarnassos, 3rd–2nd century BC (Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 117); cf. Kamps 1937, 145–179. The rituals in these cults were rather modelled on the hero-cults of the preceding and contemporary periods than on the cult of the dead, since the aim of the foundations was to separate these deceased from the ordinary dead. Furthermore, these practices cannot be said to be typical of funerary cult in general, since the purpose of the cult foundations was to separate these particular, important deceased from the mass of the ordinary dead.

90 Hdt. 5.92; cf. Leach 1976, 83.

91 Nock 1944, 590; Nilsson 1967, 179; Stupperich 1977, 61.

92 Burkert 1985, 192–193; Meuli 1946, 202–206.

93 Hom. *Il.* 22.510–514; see commentary by Richardson 1993, 162. I am grateful to David Boehringer for this reference.

94 For the treatment of such offscourings, see Parker 1983, 35–39. The animals, the blood of which was used for purifications, seem to have been destroyed, usually by

burning them, after the purification had been achieved, see below, p. 251, n. 167.

95 Cf. the calendar from Thorikos, Daux 1983, 153, lines 15–16: at the holocaust of a piglet to Zeus Polieus, the priest had to provide the attendant with lunch.

96 The earliest epigraphical instance of *enagizein* is in IG II² 1006, 26 and 69, late 2nd century BC; see further references above, pp. 75–82.

97IG IV 203, 9.

98 For references, see pp. 110–114. The only pre-2nd-century AD instance is given by Flavius Josephus, who uses *enagismos* to describe the holocaustic sacrifices in the temple at Jerusalem (BJ 1.32, 1.39, 1.148 and 6.98).

99 On the connection between *enagizein* and the world of the dead, see Chantraine & Masson 1954, 100–102; cf. Parker 1983, 5–10. *Agos* refers to the religious power that can affect humans, contrary to *hagios/hagnos*, see Vernant 1990, 137. Cf. Pirenne-Delforge 2001, 122, who suggests that a similar distinction can be observed in Pausanias' use of the terms *kathagizein* and *enagizein*, only the latter being connected to the identity of the recipient of the sacrifice.

100 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 9–13.

101 Translation by Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 15.

102 Cf. Scullion (2000, 165), who suggests that such rituals were common at sacrifices to heroes.

103 The alternative, less likely interpretation, is to consider the wine libation and the burning of a ninth portion of the meat as actions to be performed in addition to the “as to the heroes” ritual, the contents of which are unknown.

104 Cf. Paus. 10.4.10, blood being poured through a hole into the tomb of the Heros Archegetes at Tronis; Garland 1985, 114. For libating through the roof, see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 30–31 and 70–73.

105 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 17 and commentary p. 36, line A 16, and p. 71–72.

106 See Henrichs 1983, 98–99; cf. Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 72–73.

107 Herakles, *supra*, p. 221, nn. 29–30; Semele, *supra*, p. 220, n. 27.

108LSS 19, 33.

109 On the question of the heroes also being polluted, see also below, pp. 263–265.

110 Verbanck-Piérard 1989, 46–53; Lévêque & Verbanck-Piérard 1992, 53–64; see also *supra*, p. 226, n. 54.

111 Pirenne-Delforge 2001, 120–121; cf. Bonnet 1988, 346–371. At Lindos, Herakles was said to have prepared and eaten a *whole* ox, leaving no scope for any sharing of the meat and communal consumption (see Durand 1986, 156–173). This mythical background to the cult of Herakles on Rhodos can be taken as a further indication of his particular position, even though the cult at Lindos did not contain any destruction sacrifices. On Herakles' exceptional behaviour towards meat and consumption, see also Verbanck-Piérard 1992, 97–98.

112 On the fire rituals, see Nilsson 1922 and 1923. On the cult on Mount Oite and the archaeological remains, see Verbanck-Piérard 1989, 58, n. 38; Pappadakis 1919, 25–

33; Pantos 1990, 174; Krummen 1990, 62–63 with n. 16.

113LSS 19, 84.

114LS 20 B, 14; cf. Pind. *Isthm.* 5.32–33, Iolaos being honoured (see also *supra*, p. 205).

115LSS 19, 84–86.

116 Verbanck-Piérard 1989, 53, speaking of the “satellite” cult of Ioleos.

117 Hdt. 1.167.

118 On the problems of picturing a festival with games and horse-races but without sacrifice followed by dining, see above, p. 83, n. 272. Still, the possibility remains that this cult may have been a particular Etruscan feature only described in Greek terms.

119LS 18, col. II, 16–20; col. IV, 20–23; col. V, 12–15.

120 See above, p. 133, n. 13.

121 Mikalson 1977, 430; Johnston 1999, 44, however, erroneously locating the sacrifice to Zeus Epopetes to the same day.

122 Jacoby 1944, 62–65; cf. *supra*, p. 84, n. 275.

123 Hollis 1990, 127–130; Callim. *Aet. fr.* 238, line 11 (*Suppl. Hell.* 1983).

124 The similarities between the funeral cremation rites and the burning of the god's portion at a *thysia*, as well as holocaustic sacrifices, have been emphasized by Vernant 1989, 38–41; Vernant 1991, 69–70; Burkert 1985, 63; on the general connection between funeral and sacrifice, see Burkert 1983, 48–58. See also *supra*, p. 238, n. 112, for the relation between Herakles' suicide and the sacrificial practices of his cult. The battle of Marathon gave rise to the institution of a annual goat sacrifice to Artemis Agrotera, the goat being her favourite victim, which was also used for the battle-line *sphagia* directed to Artemis (see Jameson 1991, 209–210; Vernant 1991, 247–248).

125 Verbanck-Piérard (1998, 120, n. 52) suggests that the calendar reflects the combined cult of two divine pairs, Hera Thelchinia (21st of Metageitnion) with Zeus Epopetes, and Basile with Epops, and argues that these sacrifices must be very old, since they extend over the turn of the months Metageitnion and Boedromion.

126 To define the modern equivalents of the ancient months is difficult, owing to the irregularities in the ancient calendar (see Samuel 1972, 58; Pritchett 1979, 164–166). Cf. the following definitions of Hekatombaion: *KIPauly* 2 (1975), s.v. Hekatombaion 2, Hekatombaion = July/August, but also Metageitnion = July/August (*KIPauly* 3 [1975], s.v.); Bischoff 1912, 2785–2786, Hekatombaion = June/July; Woodhead 1992, 58, from end the of the 5th century, Hekatombaion = July; Jameson 1988, 117, n. 23, Hekatombaion equated with August, rather than July/August, for simplicity.

127 Scullion (1994, 110–111) has suggested that Zeus Epopetes is to be understood as belonging to the category of mountain-top Zeuses concerned with the weather and that a similar function could be argued for Epops, the “Overseer”. For Zeus as a weather god, see also Parker 1996, 29–32. Cf. the sacrifices to Zeus on Keos at mid-summer to bring in cooling winds (Burkert 1983, 109–110; Burkert 1985, 266).

128Mir. ausc. 840a.

129Ath. pol. 58.1.

130 See discussion pp. 83–85. Perhaps Harmodios and Aristogeiton were given *enagismata*, since they were, in some sense, considered to be impure, having committed a sacrilege by killing Hippias at a religious festival, see Thuc. 6.56–57; cf. Parker 1983, 159–160. Robert Parker has also suggested to me the possibility that the *enagismata* marked the fact that Harmodios and Aristogeiton had died recently, thus being closer to the ordinary dead than were the heroes in general.

131 Stengel 1910, 19; Ziehen 1939, 615; Rudhardt 1958, 262; Burkert 1983, 5; Durand 1989a, 90–92; van Straten 1995, 104–105. I hope to deal more extensively elsewhere with the uses of animal blood in Greek religious contexts.

132 Aesch. Sept. 275–279 (for the text, see Hutchinson 1985, with commentary pp. 87–88); Ar. Thesm. 695; Ar. Pax 1020; Theoc. Epigr. 1.5; Lucian De sacr. 9 and 13; Philostr. VA 1.1.

133 For example: Louvre G112, Athenian red-figure kylix, van Straten 1995, V147, fig. 110 (my Fig. 7); Palermo MN V661 a, Athenian red-figure kylix, van Straten 1995, V198, fig. 133; Athens NM 9683, Athenian red-figure pelike, van Straten 1995, V341, fig. 49; Frankfurt β 413, Athenian red-figure bell-krater, van Straten 1995, V178, fig. 126; London BM F 66, Apulian, red-figure bell-krater, van Straten 1995, V384, fig. 43; cf. the wooden pinax from Pitsa, van Straten 1995, fig. 56; cf. Durand 1991, 47–48.

134 Stengel 1910, 117; Rudhardt 1958, 261; van Straten 1995, 104–105.

135 Louvre G112, van Straten 1995, V147, fig. 110. The small group of scenes showing youths wrestling with bulls, and in one case even piercing the throat of the animal, do not include any altar (see van Straten 1995, V141, fig. 115 and V145, fig. 116 and my Fig. 12).

136 On the depictions of purification sacrifices, see *infra*, p. 289, n. 376. For purifications by the blood of a piglet, see Parker 1983, 30 with n. 66, 230 and 371–373. This particular vase is furthermore unusual, since it prominently displays the sacrificial knife, which is usually not depicted (see Peirce 1993, 232 and 234, who considers the motif a *thysia*).

137 For iconographical representations, see also, for example, Copenhagen NM 13567, Caeretan hydria, van Straten 1995, V120, fig. 114; Ferrarra T 499 VT, Athenian red-figure kylix, van Straten 1995, V347, fig. 53; Louvre C 10.754, Athenian red-figure stamnos, van Straten 1995, V135, fig. 47 (sceptical); see also below, p. 245, n. 140. For the written sources, see Stengel 1910, 117; Casabona 1966, 180; van Straten 1995, 105 with n. 8. In Homer, the *sphageion* is called *amnion*, which is also a medical term for a foetal membrane collecting blood, see King 1987, 117–126.

138 See the vessel depicted on the Viterbo vase (my Fig. 12, p. 274), van Straten 1995, V141, fig. 115; Barbieri & Durand 1985, fig. 7, which, in fact, is similar in shape to the modern vessels used for blood collecting at slaughter, see Divakaran 1982, 13, fig. 2.

139 Blood clots within three to ten minutes, see Divakaran 1982, 6. Today,

chemicals are often used to avoid coagulation, but defibrination, vigorous stirring with a rough-surfaced rod to which the fibrin responsible for the clotting sticks, is still practised (Divakaran 1982, 41). For the treatment of blood in modern times, see also Durand-Tullou 1976, 97–98. For an ancient example of blood being whipped, see Erasistratos (3rd century BC, ap. Ath. 7.324a), who describes a dish of cooked meat stewed in blood that had been thoroughly beaten. Blood may also have been mixed with vinegar or red wine to prevent coagulation, as modern experiments have shown, see Marinatos 1986, 25, n. 80.

140 Depictions of *sphageia* in connection with meat: Boston MFA 99.527, Athenian black-figure oinochoe, van Straten 1995, V213, fig. 157, Berthiaume 1982, pl. 15:2; Paris, Fondation Custodia 3650, Athenian black-figure pelike (my Fig. 9), van Straten 1995, V151, Berthiaume 1982, pl. 19, Durand 1989a, 111, fig. 8; Munich, Athenian red-figure lekythos (my Fig. 8), van Straten 1995, V230, Berthiaume 1982, pl. 15:1; Ferrarra T 256 b VP, Athenian red-figure Janiform kantharos, van Straten 1995, V152, fig. 119, Berthiaume 1982, pl. 20; Berlin 1915, Athenian black-figure olpe (sacrifice of a tuna fish), Durand 1989a, 116, fig. 20.

141 Ar. *Thesm.* 750–755.

142Od. 20.25–28.

143LSA 44, 12, from Miletos, c. 400 BC; LS 151 A, 52, from Kos, c. 350 BC; LS 156 A, 29 (restored), from Kos, c. 300–250 BC; for commentary, see Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 14. A fragmentary cult regulation from Thasos (LSS 70, 5, late 4th to early 3rd century BC) mentions a κύστις (bladder), which could have been filled with fat or blood (see commentary by Sokolowski).

144 Sophilos fr. 6 (PCG VII, 1989). Cf. also Ar. *Nub.* 409: Strepsiades fries a stuffed stomach, which bursts.

145*Zomos melas*: *Matron Convivium* 94 (Brandt 1888), 4th century BC; Theophr. *Char.* 8.6 (where the word is used metaphorically for a bloodbath); Plut. *Vit. Lyc.* 12.6. *Haimatia*: Poll. *Onom.* 6.57 (Bethe 1900–31).

146 Artemidoros of Tarsus (1st century BC) ap. Ath. 14.662d; Epainetos ap. Ath. 14.662d–e. The *myma* could also be made with fish. Cf. the *mimarkys*, a similar kind of meat-stew including blood, mentioned in a scholion on Ar. *Ach.* 1112 a II (Wilson 1975) and by Hsch. s.v. *mímarkuv* (Latte 1953–66, M 1371).

147 Erasistratos ap. Ath. 7.324a; Glaukos of Lokris ap. Ath. 7.324a; cf. Hipponax, fr. 166 (West 1971–72), a “squid-pudding”.

148 Τὸ δὲ κάλλιον γάρως, τὸ καλούμενον αἱμάτιον, followed by a recipe on how to prepare it (*Geoponica* 20.46.6 [Beckh 1895], AD 10).

149 The infrequent mention of blood products can be compared with how rarely the boiling of meat is reported, though that cooking method must have been widespread (see Burkert 1983, 89, n. 29; Berthiaume 1982, 15–16). Cf. the *harpax* from the Menelaion, used for fishing up pieces of boiled meat (Catling & Cavanagh 1976, 153–157) and the boiling of meat shown on the “Ricci hydria” (van Straten 1995, V154, fig. 122).

150 The cleaning of intestines in connection with sacrifices is discussed by Németh 1994, 63–64.

151 Γαστρόπτης, *IG II²* 1638 B, 67 (359/8 BC); *ID* 104, 142. *Gastropotín*, *IG XI:2* 161 B, 128 (3rd century BC). *Gastropotín*, *IG II²* 199 B, 79 (275–274 BC). Cf. Poll. *Onom.* 10.105 (Bethe 1900–31) γαστρόπτης δὲ ἐν τοῖς Δημοπράτοις πέπραται, καὶ δευτήρ, κοινὸν ἄρτοποιῷ καὶ μαγεῖρῳ σιεῦος, ἀπὸ τοῦ δεύειν ὀνομασμένον. This vessel was used for “dry” cooking and may have been some kind of grill or toasting rack, pan or tray, see Amyx 1958, 232.

152 For the preparation of the *boudin noir* in intestines and boiling them in connection with the slaughter, see Durand-Tullou 1976, 97–98; Marchenay 1976, 120. The blood sausages may later have been sold (see Berthiaume 1982, 48 with n. 24; cf. Theophr. *Char.* 9.4, a vendor of tripe).

153 The blood makes up c. 3–5 % of the weight of the modern animals usually slaughtered for consumption, see Divakaran 1982, 50. Dahl & Hjort 1976, 173, gives the figure 3.4–3.5 % for East African cattle, which in size may perhaps be closer to the animals of antiquity than the European modern livestock. On the nutritive value of blood, see also Dahl & Hjort 1976, 172 and 218.

154 For the handling of dung and ashes, see Németh 1994. Unused blood is a major source of contamination, since it putrefies so easily, a fact which requires particular precautions in modern slaughter houses, see Divakaran 1982, 3–4.

155 The amount of blood collected at slaughter is difficult to estimate, since it depends on how the animal is butchered. The East African cattle studied by Dahl and Hjort (1976, 174) each gave c. eight litres of blood, while a modern European ox yields 10–12 litres of blood, according to a French butcher.

156 It should be pointed out that the blood was prepared before being eaten. Consumption of raw blood is a different matter, which is clear from the tradition claiming that Themistokles committed suicide by drinking the blood from a bull (Ar. *Eq.* 83–84; Plut. *Vit. Them.* 31.6; Diod. *Sic.* 11.58.8) and the female oracle of Apollon at Argos drinking blood and becoming possessed with the god (Paus. 2.24.1). Raw blood is not dangerous for humans to consume, as is clear from pastoralists bleeding their cattle occasionally, for example in East Africa, see Dahl & Hjort 1976, 171–174 and 218.

157 On the lack of a blood taboo, see Burkert 1985, 59; Himmelmann 1997, 10, n. 6. For the relationship between the Near Eastern and the Greek sacrificial practices, see Bergquist 1993; Burkert 1966, 102, n. 34; Burkert 1985, 51 with n. 46.

158 Ringgren 1982, 154–155 and 157; Hubert & Mauss 1964, 34–36 with nn. 201, 202 and 221.

159 Bradbury 1995; cf. Himmelmann 1997, 60–62, on the killing of animals losing its religious character in the Christian sphere. On Tertullianus’ and Origines’ views on blood not to be eaten by the Christians, see Grimm 1996, 122 and 144.

160 Dalby 1996, 197. Cf. the Christian, neo-Greek sacrifices, at which the blood does not seem to be kept and eaten but disposed of into a ditch, together with the rest of

the inedible parts (tail, ears, horns, bile). The blood from these sacrifices can be used for making the sign of the cross or fingerprints to procure good health and fertility, for divinatory purposes or for protecting the church, see Georgoudi 1989, 190 with n. 42; Aikaterinides 1979, 171 and 173–176.

161 See also the sacrifice to the *elasteros* in the Selinous *lex sacra* (Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, B 12–13), βόνα τῶι, ἐλαστέροι χρέζει θύεν, θύεν ὁσπερ τοῖς ἀθανάτοισι,. σφαζέτο δ' ἐς γᾶν . This ritual must have been a *thysia* of the regular kind but modified by letting the blood flow into the ground. The fact that this handling of the blood is explicitly pointed out, can be taken as an indication of that this was not the usual practice at a *thysia*.

162 Cf. Ziehen 1929, 1669–1670.

163 Parker 1983, *passim*; Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 73–76 and 116–120; cf. van Straten 1995, 4.

164 Parker 1983, 225–232 and 371–373.

165 Parker 1983, 371–373; Burkert 1985, 76–77 and 80–82; Pritchett 1979, 196–202.

166 Parker 1983, 283, with. n. 11.

167 Kevin Clinton, in a paper on pig sacrifices presented at the seminar entitled *Greek sacrificial ritual, Olympian and Chthonian* at Gothenburg in April 1997, argued that most pigs (and other animals) used for purifications were subsequently destroyed in holocausts.

168 Parker 1983, 139, n. 142, and 393; Healey 1964.

169 Stengel 1920, 136–138; Ziehen 1929, 1671–1673; Burkert 1985, 250–252; Faraone 1993, 65–80; Casabona 1966, 165.

170 Xen. An. 2.2.9; Aesch. Sept. 42–53; Eur. Supp. 1194–1202.

171 Dem. Arist. 67–68; Ath. pol. 7.1 and 55.5; cf. also Paus. 5.24.9–11; Poll. Onom. 8.86 (Bethe 1900–31). For further examples, see Faraone 1993, 68–75; Casabona 1966, 220–225. The interpretation by Stengel 1910, 78–85, that *tomia* were the cut-off testicles of the victim has been rejected by Casabona 1966, 220–225.

172 Stengel 1920, 137–138; Ziehen 1929, 1674; cf. Stengel 1914, 97–98, on the burning of the parts of the animals used at the oath-takings. To use the animals after the oath ceremony, presumably for consumption, seems to have been rare. The lambs used for the oath sworn by the Greeks and Trojans in *Il.* 3.292–301 were removed by Priamos (3.310). The meat from the goat from an oath-sacrifice to the Charites on Kos (*LS* 151D, 5–17) seems to have been eaten, see Pirenne-Delforge 1996, 210–212. Cf. Pausanias' remark that he forgot to ask what they did with the victim used for the oath taken by the athletes at Olympia (5.24.9–11).

173 Burkert 1985, 250–251; Casabona 1966, 165 and 215–216.

174 For the evidence and discussion, see Jameson 1991; Jameson 1994b; Casabona 1966, 165–166 and 180–191; Vernant 1991, 244–257.

175 An idea of how such a divination may have been carried out can perhaps be gleaned from the modern, Moroccan, Muslim ram sacrifices performed annually to predict the prosperity of the coming year, see Combs-Schilling 1989, 212–232. The

ram is held on its back, its head turned towards Mecca and the person performing the sacrifice plunges the knife deeply into the ram's throat. The way the blood spurts, whether the ram manages to stand up after having its throat cut and how long it will live after it has fallen are among the signs to be observed.

176 Jameson 1991, 211–212; Henrichs 1981, 213–214 and 219–220.

177 Stengel 1920, 135–136; Nilsson 1906, 425–426; Jameson 1991, 202–203.

178 LS 96, 35–37, c. 200 BC.

179 Cf. Jameson 1991, 203 with n. 16.

180 Jameson 1991, 202–203; Casabona 1966, 189–190.

181 Rivers, the sea and springs were also given sacrifices at which the victims were plunged into the water and drowned (Burkert 1985, 138–139; Stengel 1920, 135).

182 Stengel 1910, 146–153; Stengel 1920, 126–127; Nilsson 1906, 444–445; Casabona 1966, 228–229; Hampe 1967.

183 Hampe 1967, 12.

184 Evidence collected by Stengel 1910, 146–153.

185 Eitrem 1912, 1123; Stengel 1920, 148; Meuli 1946, 193–194; Burkert 1985, 60.

186 Stengel 1920, 148–149; Rohde 1925, 167–169; Garland 1985, 113–115. See also the Derveni papyrus, col. VI, 6–7 and col. II, 5; Laks & Most 1997, 10–12; Tsantsanoglou 1997, 102–103.

187 [Pl.] *Min.* 315c.

188 See discussion by Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 77–83. Garland 1985, 112, takes the blood sacrifice performed by Odysseus in *Od.* 10.526–540 to be a description of a regular sacrifice to the dead. See further discussion above, pp. 62–63 and p. 73.

189 *Il.* 23.166–178.

190 *Il.* 23.30–34, esp. 34: πάντη δ' ἄμφι νέκυν κοτυλήρυτον ἔρρεεν αἶμα, either referring to the blood being so plentiful that it could be taken in cups or the blood actually being caught in cups and poured out, see Richardson 1993, 169, line 34; Burkert 1985, 60.

191 *Eur. El.* 91–92; cf. 511–515.

192 *Eur. Hec.* 124–126, 260–261, 391–393 and 528–537.

193 *Eur. Heracl.* 1026–1036 and 1040–1043. Other examples: *Aesch. Ag.* 1277–1278; *Eur. Alc.* 845; *Eur. Hel.* 1255; *Eur. Tro.* 622–623.

194 Mikalson 1991, 114–123, cf. 29–45; Garland 1985, xi, considers tragedy as drawing more from hero-cult than from the cult of the ordinary dead. Cf. Henrichs 1991, 200, arguing that tragedy focuses on the abnormal dead, while comedy reflects the attitude to the normal dead.

195 *Hom. Il.* 23.22–23 and 175–176; *Eur. Hec.* 528–537. Cf. Casabona 1966, 168–170, on the terms *aposphazein* and *kataspazein*, which are used almost exclusively for the killing of humans.

196 The mention of blood rituals to the dead in the tragedies could be seen as an influence from hero-cult, but each passage cannot automatically be taken as a description of or reference to an actual hero-cult, see Mikalson 1991, 31–45; see also

below, p. 261, n. 228.

197LS 97 A, 12–13 = IG XII:5 593: προσφαγίωι [χ]ρέσθαι κατὰ τὰ π[άτριά].

198 See discussion above, pp. 229–230. Furthermore, to share a victim with an unburied family member would have been to share his condition as unburied, dead and impure.

199 See Casabona 1966, 170–174: *prosphagion* is found only in the Ioulis law, while *prosphazein* and *prosphagma* are mainly found in tragedy, often concerning human sacrifice.

200 [Pl.] *Min.* 315c: ἱερεῖά τε προσφάττοντες πρὸ τῆς ἐκφορᾶς τοῦ νεκροῦ. Schol. [Pl.] *Min.* 315c (Greene 1938): ἐγχυτιστρίας'... λέγονται, δὲ καὶ ὄσαι, τοὺς ἐναγεῖς καθαίρουσιν αἷμα ἐπιχέουσαι τοῦ ἱερέως. Cf. De Schutter 1996, 335.

201LS 97 A, 14–17. One of the main purposes of the funerary laws may have been to limit and prevent the spread of pollution, see Heikkilä (forthcoming).

202 Louis Robert (1937, 306–308, no. 3) suggested the restoration προσφα[γ]ιάζ[οντες] in a late imperial epitaph recording the institution of a funerary cult in Phrygia. The terminology is unusual also in this context, since the other examples of similar texts use *thyein* or *thysia* (*ibid.* 391).

203*Enagizein* and *enagismos* used for funerary rituals in Athens refer to the burning of vegetable offerings and cakes, as well as the pouring of libations, but cannot be taken as support for the use of animal sacrifice and blood rituals in the cult of the dead.

204 See, for example, LS 77 C (= Rougemont 1977, no. 9 C and discussion pp. 51–57), the funerary law of the phratry Labyadaí, Delphi, c. 400 BC; LSA 16, Gamberion, Mysia, 3rd century BC; LS 124, Eresos, Samos, 2nd century BC; cf. Seaford 1994, 74–78; Toher 1991, 159–175.

205 Peirce 1993, 253–254; Jameson 1991, 219; Durand 1989a, 91. Human sacrifice: London BM 97.7–27.2, black-figure, “Tyrrhenian” amphora showing the death of Polyxena, van Straten 1995, V422, fig. 118; see also Durand & Lissarrague 1999, 83–106, esp. 91–102. On human sacrifices in general, see Hughes 1991; Bonnechere 1994. War *sphagia*: Cleveland 26.242, Athenian red-figure kylix (my Fig. 11, p. 272), van Straten 1995, V144, fig. 112.

206 Durand 1986, 10–11; Durand 1989a, 91–92; Peirce 1993, 220.

207 Cf. Ekroth 2000, 277–279.

208 Thuc. 5.11. Most instances of *entemnein* in hero-cult have a connection with war; see Plut. *Vit. Sol.* 9.1, heroes of Salamis; Plut. *Vit. Pel.* 22.2, daughters of Skedasos; Philostr. *Her.* 53.13, Achilles; cf. Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 290d, Enyalios; perhaps also the Scythian Toxaris who was depicted as carrying a bow, Lucian *Scythia* 1–2.

209 Discussed by Hornblower 1996, 454–456. According to Thucydides, Hagnon, who received a cult at Amphipolis prior to Brasidas, was given *timai*. It is possible that Thucydides deliberately used only the term *timai* to make a distinction between the cult of Hagnon and that of Brasidas, since the latter had been killed in war and therefore received rituals of a particular kind.

210LSS 64, 7–22.

211 See discussion above, pp. 135–136.

212 Fr. 65, lines 77–89 (Austin 1968). For references to war in this passage, cf. Robertson 1996, 45.

213 Cf. Lacore 1995–96, 102–107, suggesting that the death and subsequent cult of the Hyakinthids is to be seen as a reference to the citizens who die for their country and the honours they are promised and that the tone and content of Euripides here are reminiscent of the *epitaphioi logoi*.

214 No direct war connection can be demonstrated for Pelops, who also received a blood ritual. Zeus, however, with whom Pelops was associated at Olympia, was in the Archaic and Classical periods chiefly worshipped as a god connected with war, receiving a remarkable number of war-related offerings and having an oracle that was consulted about the outcomes of military campaigns, see Mallwitz 1972, 24–39; Sinn 1991, 38–46.

215 See also Robertson 1996, 45. Cf. the sacrifice of goats to Artemis Agrotera before battle, taken as symbolizing the imminent shedding of human blood, see Vernant 1991, 256.

216LS 96, 35–37; Jameson 1991, 203 with n. 16.

217 The best parallel to this ritual is that of the Heros Archegetes at Tronis, described by Pausanias (10.4.10): each day, the hero was honoured with animal victims, the blood of which was poured into the hero's grave, while the meat was consumed (ἔχει δ' οὖν ἐπὶ ἡμέραι τε πάσῃ τιμᾷ καὶ ἄγοντες ἰερεῖα οἱ Φωκεῖς τὸ μὲν αἷμα δι' ὁπῆς ἐσχέουσιν ἐς τὸν τάφον, τὰ δὲ κρέα ταύτῃ σφίσις ἀναλοῦν καθέστηκεν). The identity of this hero is unknown, but it is interesting to note that, according to one tradition reported to Pausanias, he was a famous soldier called Xanthippos.

218 Ekroth 2000, 279, figs. 3–4; Dunst 1964, 482–485, fig. 1, who also discusses possible connections with the Attic Leukaspis mentioned in the Erchia calendar (LS 18, col. III, 50–53); Caltabiano 1992, 273; Jenkins 1972, fig. 421 and p. 169. For a discussion of the coin type, see Raven 1957, 77–81, who proposes a date around 412 BC.

219 For altars and sacrifices in the Greek numismatic material, see Aktseli 1996, 50–54; Ayala 1989, 56–65, esp. 59; cf. Liegle 1936, 203.

220 Jameson 1994b, 320–324, nos. 1–12, esp. 323, no. 9, the animals all being rams. Bulls are used for the *sphagia* shown on the Nike parapet (Jameson 1994b). There are also a few examples of the Leukaspis coin type which show only the ram and no altar, see Rizzo 1946, pl. 47:5; Lacroix 1965, 50–51.

221 In the regular *thysia* scenes, the dead victim is shown only when being opened up or cut up into portions (see van Straten 1995, 115–153). A parallel to the position and appearance of the dead ram on the Leukaspis coin is to be found on an Athenian red-figure stamnos by the Triptolemos painter (ARV 2 361/7) showing Aias or Achilles fighting Hektor, both being restrained by older men. Between the

warriors lies a ram on its back with its throat deeply cut and blood running out of the wound. The vase-painter has named the ram PAT[, presumably Patroklos; for the various interpretations, see Schmidt M. 1969, 141–152; Griffiths 1985, 49–50; Griffiths 1989, 39; Jameson 1994b, 320, no. 2. Cf. also a Roman coin from Magnesia showing Themistokles with a phiale and a sword next to an altar and the front part of a bull, see Rhousopoulos 1896, 21; Podlecki 1975, 170–171 and pl. 3:c.

222 Raven 1957, 77–81; cf. Lacroix 1965, 51. For Leukaspis' war connections, see also an early-6th-century dedication from Samos to this hero showing a shield and the front part of a ship (Dunst 1972, 100–106 and pl. 45–46). The monument was put up by two men from the same island, thanking Leukaspis for helping them at a Sicanian attack on Himera.

223 The connection between heroes and war is further underlined by heroes being shown on reliefs as armed, with or without horses (van Straten 1995, 93–94) and the presence of weapons in the banqueting hero-reliefs, in particular those from Thasos (Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 58).

224 Cf. Jameson 1951, 49–51, for the connections that heroes have with the territory. Cf. the heroes Echetlos and Marathon participating in the battle at Marathon, Paus. 1.32.4–5.

225 Plut. *Vit. Sol.* 9.1.

226 Plut. *Vit. Pel.* 21–22; *Am. narr.* 774d.

227 Parth. *Amat. Narr.* 35.2.

228 Soph. OC 621–622: ἵν' οὐμὸς εὐδῶν καὶ κειρυμμένος νέκυς ψυχρὸς ποτ' αὐτῶν θερμὸν αἶμα πίεται. The OC has often been suggested to imply a hero-cult of Oidipous at Athens, see Kearns 1988, 48 and 189; Méautis 1940, 37–51; cf. Seaford 1994, 130–136. This passage, however, is not to be used as evidence for the ritual practices of such a cult, since the tomb is to be secret and unapproachable and receive no regular cult (see Mikalson 1991, 41). The strongest advocates for OC reflecting an actual cult of Oidipous are Henrichs (1983) and Edmunds (1981, 229, n. 31). Their opinion is partly based on a fragment of the *Thebais* (Allen 1912, 113, fr. 2; 7th–6th century BC), in which the terms παρέθηκεν τράπεζαν (line 2) and γέρεα (line 6) are used in connection with Oidipous, which, Henrichs and Edmunds argue, suggests the existence of a hero-cult of Oidipous. This reasoning seems strange, since Oidipous in that particular context is still alive and quarrels with his sons over the distribution of meat after a sacrifice; cf. Bethe 1891, 102–103.

229 Cf. the *haimakouria* to the war dead at Plataiai described by Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.1–5. The rituals to these war dead seem to have undergone changes from the 5th century BC to the 2nd century AD, see above, p. 124, n. 450. Welwei 1991, 56, considers the 2nd-century AD ritual as being more or less intact from the 5th century BC.

230 Thuc. 2.34–46; cf. Hornblower 1991, 292.

231 Pl. *Menex.* 249b; Dem. *Epitaph.* 36.

232 Lys. *Epitaph.* 80: those fallen in war are worthy of receiving the same honours as

the immortals (ὡς ἀξίους ὄντας τοὺς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τετελευτηκότας ταῖς αὐταῖς τιμαῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀθανάτους τιμᾶσθαι); Dem. *Epitaph*. 36: the war dead as possessors of ageless honours, who had had a memorial of their valour erected by the State, and were deemed deserving of sacrifices and immortal games (σεμνὸν δέ γ' ἀγήρως τιμὰς καὶ μνήμην ἀρετῆς δημοσίᾳ κητσαμένους ἐπιδεῖν, καὶ θυσιῶν καὶ ἀγώνων ἡξιωμένους ἀθανάτων); Stesimbrotos *FGrHist* 107 F 9: Perikles declared that the fallen in the Samian War had become immortal like the gods (τοὺς ἐν Εἰάμῳ τεθνηκότας ... ἀθανάτους ἔλεγε γεγονέναι καθάπερ τοὺς θεοὺς); cf. Parker 1996, 135–136; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 191–195; Loraux 1986, 40–41.

233 On the immortal state of the war dead, see also Hyp. *Epitaph*. 27–30; Simonides' epitaph for the fallen at Thermopylai (no. 532, Campbell 1991); cf. Rudhardt 1958, 122–125. The fact that the Athenian war dead did not receive *enagizein* sacrifices (in this period) may have been a further way of distancing them from death. Cf. also Fuqua 1981 on Tyrtaios' allusion to the Spartan war dead being considered as immortal. The religious status of the war dead, as well as their cult, is a complex question, which I hope to be able to pursue further elsewhere.

234 Parker 1983, 37–39; *LS* 97 B, 1–11.

235 See above, p. 256.

236 For graves of heroes located in sanctuaries of gods, see Pfister 1909–12, 450–459; Vollgraff 1951, 315–396. In speaking of the funerals of the “Examiners”, Plato states that priests and priestesses are to participate in the funeral procession as to τῇ τάφῃ a tomb that is pure (ὡς καθαρεύοντι τῷ τάφῳ), even though they are barred from approaching all other tombs (*Leg.* 947d). These “pure” tombs were probably the tombs of heroes.

237 *LS* 154 A, 21–22 and 37; *LS* 156 A, 10. According to Herzog's restoration of *LS* 156 A, 9–10, the priestess could not participate in the sacrifices to the chthonian gods or the heroes. However, this restoration is highly conjectural (see above p. 135, n. 23). The superstitious man in the *Characters* of Theophrastos (16.9) refuses to step on a gravestone (*mnema*), to view a corpse or to visit a woman in childbirth, so as not to incur pollution. A *heroon*, however, does not seem to have posed any danger to him.

238 *LSS* 115 A, 21–25, late 4th century BC. For the interpretation of the passage, see discussions by Parker 1983, 336–339; Malkin 1987, 206–212; Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 110–111; cf. Nock 1944, 577.

239 Paus. 5.13.3. In the case of Telephos, a bath would allow the worshipper to enter the temple of Asklepios.

240 On the impure Tritopatores, see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 9–12, and above, pp. 221–223 and pp. 235–238.

241 Parker 1983, 42; Pritchett 1979, 196–202; cf. Bremmer 1983b, 105. The sacrifices on the battlefield after the battle at the tropaion were regular *thysia*, see Durand 1996, 50–52.

242 See Johnston 1999, 149–150; Bremmer 1983b, 105–108.

243 Jameson 1991, 212–213.

244 Seaford 1994, 123–139. The concept of the heroes being angry and revengeful at being violently killed and having died seems mainly to have been a later development (see Rose 1953, 1052–1057, cf. Nock 1950, 713–714; Waszink 1954, 391–394; Nilsson 1967, 183–184). Revengeful spirits are another matter. The *elasteroi* at Selinous receive *thysia* sacrifices “as to the immortals”, but the blood is to flow into the ground, see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, B 12–13.

245 Johnston 1999, 129–139.

246 Chantraine & Masson 1954, 85–106; Parker 1983, 6.

247 Strabon 6.3.9; see Petropoulou 1985; cf. Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 83 and 95, on the *Διὸς ἡψύδιον* used for purifications.

248 The terms *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* occasionally occur in contexts mentioning purifications (Kleidemos *FGrHist* 323 F 14; Polyb. 23.10.17; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 270a), but a more direct connection between these terms and concepts of pollution is to be found only in the lexicographers and the scholia, e.g. Hsch. s.v. *ἐναγίζειν* (Latte 1953–66, E 2586); *Etym. Magn.* s.v. *ἐναγίζειν* (Gaisford 1848); schol. Hom. *Od.* 1.291 (Dindorf 1855). Cf. the development of *agos* and *enages* to become synonymous with *miasma* and *miaros* from the late 4th century BC (Parker 1983, 8, n. 35).

249 Cf. Ekroth 2000, 274–277.

250 Page 1955, 24–25; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 82–83.

251 Paus. 9.39.6.

252 Most examples come from later sources, see Heliod. *Aeth.* 6.14.3–6; oracle given by Apollon at Klaros, Krauss 1980, no. 11; see further above, pp. 60–74. Cf. also the female oracle of Apollon at Argos drinking blood to become possessed by the god (Paus. 2.24.1).

253 Eur. *Hec.* 534–541.

254 See above, pp. 173–175; cf. Plut. *Vit. Sol.* 9.1; *Vit. Pel.* 21–22; *Am. narr.* 774 d.

255 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 12–13, see also commentary pp. 119–120; cf. Clinton 1996, 179.

256 Philostr. *V A* 4.16; Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.1026–1041 and 3.1104–1222; Lucian *Philops.* 14.

257 Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 77 and 83; cf. below, pp. 285–286.

258 On the importance of calling and acclaiming the hero, in particular by using *chaire*, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 197. Johnston (1999, 155) further suggests that calling the hero was a way of locating him at a desired location, a kind of *goeteia*.

259 See discussion above, pp. 171–172, 178 and 190–192.

260 On the question with which games the sacrifices to the *Agathoi* should be connected, see Pouilloux 1954b, 378; Bergquist (forthcoming). A later case of a blood ritual in connection with games to a hero is the foundation of Kritolaos, at Aigale, Amorgos. At the yearly festival to this young hero a ram was to be slaughtered (*σφαζέτωσαν*) at the *agon*, boiled whole and used for prizes in the contest; *LSS* 61 =

Laum 1914, vol. 2, no. 50, lines 74–80, late 2nd century BC.

261Aet. book 2, fr. 43, lines 80–83.

262 Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.1–5. The term *deipnon* was mainly used for “dinners” associated with apotropaic and cathartic rites, such as the *deipna* to Hekate, see Jameson 1994a, 38. Among the few cases of positive connotations of *deipna*, Jameson places the sacrifices to the war dead at Plataiai.

263 Philostr. *Her.* 53.11–12.

264 Hom. *Od.* 11.97–99; Eur. *Hec.* 536–537; cf. also Soph. *OC* 612–622, Oidipous is to be buried in the Athenian soil and drink the blood of its enemies.

265 Cf. Jouan 1981, on calling the dead in tragedy; cf. Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 197.

266 Mikalson 1991, 121. It seems rather to have been desired to keep the dead at a distance, particularly from the Archaic period and onwards, see Johnston 1999, *passim*. At the Anthesteria, when the souls of the dead were thought to come up into the world of the living, various precautions were undertaken (Rohde 1925, 168; Deubner 1969, 111–114; Parke 1977, 116–117). At the Genesia, the state celebration in honour of the dead, sacrifices were primarily performed to Ge, even though some kinds of offerings were probably also brought for the departed, see Deubner 1969, 229–230.

267 Johnston 1999, 23–35. Possibly the explicit case of the dead drinking blood and being revitalized in the *Nekyia* is to be put in connection with the Homeric concept of the dead as weak and powerless shades; cf. Johnston 1999, 8–9; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 81–83.

268 See, for example, the use of curse tablets, Johnston 1999, 71–81.

269 Deneken 1886–90, 2505; von Fritze 1903, 64–66; Stengel 1910, 113–125; Eitrem 1912, 1124; Stengel 1920, 112; Rohde 1925, 116; Ziehen 1929, 1670–1671; Rudhardt 1958, 261–262 and 285–286; Scullion 1994, 97, n. 60; Scullion 2000, 169.

270 Stengel 1910, 113–125; Rohde 1925, 116; Rudhardt 1958, 285–286.

271*Il.* 1.458–459: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' εὐξάντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο, αὐέρυσαν μὲν πρῶτα καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν.

272 Schol. *Il.* 1.459 (Dindorf 1875, vol. 1): αὐέρυσαν: εἰς τοῦπίσω ἀνέκλων τὸν τράχηλον τοῦ θυομένου ἱερείου, ὡς προσέχειν εἰς οὐρανὸν τοῖς θεοῖς οἷς καὶ ἐθύοντο, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν ὄντων ἐν οὐρανῷ. πάλιν δὲ τοῖς ἥρωσιν, ὡς κατθιχομένοις, ἔντομα ἔθυσον ἀποβλέποντες κάτω εἰς γῆν. This information is found in the so-called Didymos scholia, not included in the *scholia maiora* published by Erbse (schol. *Il.* 1.459, Erbse 1969–88, vol. 1).

273 For the meaning of *entoma*, see Casabona 1966, 228.

274 Schol. *Ap. Rhod. Argon.* 1.587 (Wendel 1935): ἔντομα δὲ τὰ σφάγια, κυρίως τὰ τοῖς νεκροῖς ἐναγίζόμενα, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν ἀποτεμένεσθαι τὰς κεφαλὰς. οὕτω γὰρ θύουσιν, τοῖς χθονίοις, τοῖς δὲ οὐρανίοις ἄνω ἀνιστρέφοντες τὸν τράχηλον σφάζουσιν Casabona 1966, 226, mistakenly refers this scholion to Thucydides.

275 Plut. *Vit. Pel.* 21–22. This story is referred to in less detail also by other sources,

see above, p. 97, n. 323.

276 Plut. *Vit. Pel.* 22.2, ed. Ziegler 1968.

277 Von Fritze 1903, 66; Stengel 1910, 104, n. 1; Rudhardt 1958, 285–286. For the reading *katastrepsantes*, see Plut. *Vit. Pel.* 22.2, ed. Ziegler 1968, app. crit., line 23.

278Od. 10.527–528.

279Od. 11.35–36. On this sacrifice resulting in a decapitation of the victims, see above, pp. 174–175, esp. n. 187.

280 Casabona 1966, 155–196, 211–229 and 337–338.

281 Material collected and discussed in Jameson 1991, 217–219 with n. 49, and Jameson 1994b, 320–324; cf. van Straten 1995, 103–113.

282 The interpretation of the clearest depiction of a sacrifice of this kind, a tondo of a fragmentary, red-figure kylix now in Cleveland (my Fig. 11), is complicated by the problem of how the picture is to be oriented. This is clear if one compares how Jameson (1991, 218, fig. 1) and van Straten (1995, V144, fig. 112) have placed the vase. Jameson has turned the picture so that the sword of the soldier is parallel to the ground and the exposed throat of the ram is vertical to the ground. Van Straten, on the other hand, has oriented the illustration with the sword pointing towards the ground at an angle of 45° and the throat of the animal facing downwards. Considering how the head is shown on the other depictions of the same ritual, Jameson's orientation of the vase seems preferable.

283 Cf. Jameson 1991, n. 49; von Fritze 1903, 64–65.

284 See also van Straten 1995, V141, fig. 115; Barbieri & Durand 1985, figs. 1, 6 and 7.

285 Peirce 1993, 220 and 234–235, interprets the vase as showing the *sphage* in a *thysia*; van Straten 1995, 111, does not consider the scene to be a *sphagia*.

286 For sources and discussion, see van Straten 1995, 107–113; Peirce 1993, 234–235 with n. 56; Jouanna 1992, 412–413. Of particular interest is Od. 3.444–455: at this sacrifice, the vessel for the blood is kept ready, the animal is stunned and thereafter raised (the entire animal or just the head) from the ground, so that the throat can be slit and the blood flow out. If the raising refers to the whole animal, the scene described would have been very similar to that shown on the Viterbo amphora.

287 The small number of representations of the actual moment of killing should be kept in mind. Cf. the position of the head and throat of the pig on the Athenian red-figure, kylix tondo Louvre G112, showing the moments preceding the killing of the animal (my Fig. 7, p. 243), and the position of Polyxena on the vase depicting her being sacrificed (van Straten 1995, V422, fig. 118). In these two cases, however, the position of the victim seems to be dependent on what was convenient for the person performing the actual killing rather than the location of the recipient.

288 For the use of knives at *thysiai*, see Berthiaume 1982, 18 and 109–110, n. 14.

289 Odysseus uses a sword for the sacrifices in the *Nekyia* (Od. 11.24 and 11.48). In the examples of iconographical representations of *sphagia* listed by Jameson (1994b, 320–324), a sword is definitely used in nine cases out of twelve (nos. 1–5, 8–10 and

- 12; no. 6 has a sword or a dagger; no. 11 probably a sword; no. 7, no weapon mentioned). On the use of swords at depictions of human sacrifices, see Durand & Lissarrague 1999, 91–106, esp. 105. Cf. Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.2–5, esp. 21.4; the archon at Plataiai uses a sword for the *enagizein* sacrifice and *haimakouria* to the war dead.
- 290** The distinctions between piercing and slitting/cutting need to be further examined. In the depictions of the pre-battle *sphagia*, it looks as if the person killing the animal is driving his sword into the throat of the victim, rather than slitting it, see Jameson 1991, 218, fig. 1 (cf. 222, n. 9) = my Fig. 11, p. 272; Jameson 1994b, 321, figs. 18.8 and 18.9a. Stengel (1910, 120–123) and Ziehen (1929, 1670) argued that there was a vital difference between piercing and cutting the animal's throat: the former was the practice at Olympian sacrifices and the latter in chthonian rituals, but they also interpreted *sphazein* as referring to piercing and not cutting, and Stengel further underlined that the scenes showing Nike performing *sphagia* were not to be considered as being chthonian rituals.
- 291** The bending down of the head at the bleeding should not be overemphasized, since, to collect the blood at regular *thysiai*, the head of the victim must have been turned downwards or the whole carcass hung with the head facing towards the ground.
- 292** Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, B 13, see also commentary p. 45.
- 293** The sacrificial reality can be difficult to imagine. Cf. the butchers at the slaughterhouse in Berlin, who laughed at Stengel (1910, 115) when he asked them whether it was possible to lift adult living cows and then kill them, see van Straten 1995, 109. The practical difficulties of killing an animal while the head was bent down were remarked upon already by von Fritze (1903, 61–66), who instead suggested that *katastrephein* referred to the pressing of the whole animal towards the ground and not just turning down the head; see also Scullion 1994, 97, n. 60. Cf. also the Roman standard rendering of sacrifices, especially of bulls, from the early 2nd century AD to late antiquity, in which the animal's head is always bent towards the ground to show the victim's consent, a kind of representation lacking in the Greek material, see Himmelfmann 1997, 56–59; Brendel 1930.
- 294** Ziehen 1939, 582–586; Burkert 1985, 68; Gill 1991, 7–11; Jameson 1994a, 37.
- 295** Jameson 1994a, 38.
- 296** Jameson 1994a, 38.
- 297** Jameson 1994a, 37–38; Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 35–36; Burkert 1985, 68; cf. Kearns 1994.
- 298** Jameson 1994a; Burkert 1985, 107.
- 299** Jameson 1994a; Bruit 1989; Bruit 1990, 170–173.
- 300** Herakles and Dioskouroi: Verbanck-Piérard 1992; Hermary 1986; Jameson 1994a, 47–48; Gill 1991, 9. Other gods: Jameson 1994a, 53–54; Bruit 1984 (Apollon); cf. Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 67–70.
- 301** Jameson 1994a, 54–55. Preserved remains of tables are associated with a variety of recipients, see Gill 1991. These tables could have been used both for the regular

deposition of bloodless gifts and for *theoxenia*.

302 Jameson 1994a, 55.

303 Jameson 1994a, 41; Bruit 1984, 363–367.

304 Jameson 1994a, 37; cf. Gill 1991, 15–19; Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 67.

305 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 15–16 and A 19–20, cf. 64 and 68; Jameson 1994a, 43–44.

306 Garland 1985, 110; Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 215; Burkert 1985, 192; De Schutter 1996, 340–342.

307 For examples of animal bones and the uneven distribution of these remains in different grave plots and the question of animal sacrifice for the ordinary dead, see above, pp. 230–232.

308 Stengel 1920, 146; Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 145–147. Burkert 1985, 194, suggests offerings of food. According to Rohde 1925, 167, the dead man had a meal alone at the grave.

309 Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 146; Sourvinou-Inwood 1983, 41–42; Burkert 1985, 193; Johnston 1999, 42; Hughes (forthcoming).

310 Stengel 1910, 144; Stengel 1920, 146; Rohde 1925, 167.

311 Nilsson 1967, 179; Murray 1988, 250; cf. Burkert 1985, 193.

312 Rohde 1925, 167; Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 147–148; Murray 1988, 250; Johnston 1999, 63–64 and 277. Garland 1985, 110–114, is more in favour of more extensive offerings of meals, as well as animal sacrifice to the dead.

313 Rohde 1925, 168; Nilsson 1967, 181; Deubner 1969, 111–114; Parke 1977, 116; De Schutter 1996, 339–345.

314 The information on the *Chytroi* is found only in late sources, whose authors have probably mistaken the dead for Hermes, see Meuli 1946, 199–200; Nilsson 1967, 181; Deubner 1969, 111–114; Parke 1977, 116–117; Johnston 1999, 64. For the dead receiving a *panspermia* in connection with the funeral, see De Schutter 1996, 338–345. On the *Anthesteria* and its contents, see also Robertson 1993, 197–250, who suggests that the *keres* are to be understood as Carians rather than as ghosts.

315 The doorways were smeared with pitch, buckthorn was chewed and the sanctuaries closed, see Rohde 1925, 168; Deubner 1969, 111–114; Parke 1977, 116–117; Murray 1988, 251. For the fear of ghosts and the *Anthesteria* as a means to avert, appease and control the dead, see Johnston 1999, 63–71.

316 At the *Genesia*, sacrifices were offered to Ge, but private celebrations of the dead also took place on the same day, see Deubner 1969, 229–230; Georgoudi 1988, 80–89; Johnston 1999, 44 with n. 24.

317 Funerary monuments resembling tables are known from Thera (Archaic period), Athens (Hellenistic period), Macedonia and Boiotia, but it is doubtful to what extent they were used as tables for meals, see Kurtz & Boardman 1971, 168–169 and 235–236; Gill 1991, 29. In the sacred law from Selinous, a *theoxenia* ritual is used as a means to control an angry spirit, *elasteros*, but the recipient is still dangerous and has to be separated from the living while being placated, see

Johnston 1999, 48. On the exceptional use of a symposium to the dead for the purpose of necromancy, see Murray 1988, 252.

318 Stengel 1910, 126; Stengel 1920, 146–149; Rohde 1925, 170; Meuli 1946, 191–194.

319 Stengel 1920, 148–149; Meuli 1946, 191 and 198; cf. Burkert 1985, 193

320 Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 48–62; Dentzer 1982, 353–363 and 526–527; van Straten 1995, 94–95; Jameson 1994a, 53–54. Cf. Murray 1988, 244–255, who argues that there was a polarity between the world of the symposium and the world of the dead in the Greek world.

321 Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 65–67, suggests that the increase in mystery cults could have led to the ordinary dead being pictured as partaking in an eternal symposium and therefore the motif was used also in funerary contexts. However, if the motif had been used in hero-cults from the late 6th century BC, is it not possible that the cult of the dead had been influenced by the hero-cults in this matter?

322 Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 65.

323 Meuli 1946, 201, argued that the term *xenia* seems to imply that the family of the departed participated in the meals at the tomb.

324 See above, pp. 127–128.

325 Nilsson 1967, 179. Incidentally, the examples cited by Nilsson—the testament of Epikteta and the *heroon* at Kalydon—are rather to be taken as hero-cults than as examples of the cult of the ordinary dead.

326 Meuli 1946, 196–198.

327 Jameson 1994a, 53–54, is sceptical about deriving *theoxenia* from meals for the dead; cf. Gill 1991, 22–23.

328Od. 14.414–456; Gill 1991, 20–22; Jameson 1994a, 38–39; cf. Ziehen 1939, 616, who considers *theoxenia* to be an older ritual than *thysia*.

329 For the details of this sacrifice, see Kadletz 1984; Petropoulou 1987.

330 Chionides fr. 7 (PCG IV, 1983); cf. Jameson 1994a, 46–47.

331LS 20 B: *trapezai*, lines 3–4, 14–15, 23–24, 25 and 53; piglets, lines 28, 36 and 37.

332 Gill 1991, 22–23, who suggests that the idea could have come from house cults or the practice of depositing food offerings at shrines.

333 On *trapezomata*, see Jameson 1994a, 56; cf. Gill 1991, 11–15.

334 Jameson 1994a, 56–57.

335 Vernant 1989, 24–26; Bruit 1990, 171.

336 Bruit 1990, 170–173; cf. Bruit 1989.

337 There does not seem to have been any sense of commensality between gods and men in Greek sacrifices, see Jameson 1994a, 55; Nock 1944; Gill 1991, 23; Bruit 1989, 21. At *theoxenia*, the divine guests were thought of as visiting and then departing and at regular *thysia*, the divine and the human part of the sacrifice were separate, both in time and in contents. Commensality also seems to have been lacking in the cult of the dead.

338 See pp. 136–140 and 177–179.

339 Remains of actual tables have been found in the Amyneion in Athens (Körte

1893, 234; Körte 1896, 289 and pl. 11:F; Gill 1991, 69, no. 53) and the Amphiareion at Oropos (Gill 1991, 69, no. 55, and 78, no. 62). Banqueting hero-reliefs are known from both these sites, see van Straten 1995, R36–38; Petrakos 1968, 123, no. 24. Legs of tables were also found in two small shrines at Corinth, usually interpreted as belonging to heroes, see Williams 1978, 7–11, fig. 1 and pl. 1:a (Stele shrine); Williams, Fischer & MacIntosh 1974, 4–6, fig. 1 and pl. 1:b (Shrine at the crossroads). Cf. also the banquet relief dedicated to Anios on Delos and the altar/bench in the Archegeion, which may have been used in *theoxenia* ceremonies, see *supra*, pp. 36–37.

340 Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 22–24, 48–54 and 61–62; van Straten 1995, 89 and 94–100; Dentzer 1982, 503–511.

341 Van Straten 1995, 96: banqueting reliefs with animals, R115–190, with maid and *kiste*, R191–211. Most reliefs have neither worshippers nor sacrificial victims, only the reclining hero accompanied by a consort and a cupbearer, see Thönges-Stringaris 1965, 69. Cf. Salapata 1993 for the Laconian hero-reliefs, which never show any food, only drinking vessels.

342 Van Straten 1995, 96–97.

343 Jameson 1994a, 53; cf. Dentzer 1982, 335 and 519–524.

344 Jameson 1994a, 53; Verbanck-Piérard 1992, 92–93.

345 The composition of the reliefs with animal sacrifice falls into two parts, the worshippers approaching with the animal on one side and the banqueter on the other, and there are no attempts to integrate the two groups into one composition, see Dentzer 1982, 328.

346 Jameson 1994a, 53.

347 On the effects of standardization, cf. Murray 1988, 246.

348 For the financial considerations in choosing an animal victim, see van Straten 1995, 179–181.

349 On the popularity of hero-cults on the family level, see van Straten 1995, 95–96, who further points out that, judging from the names of many heroes, they were of a benevolent, kind and helpful character, which must have been particularly appealing on the private level; cf. Parker 1996, 38–39; Kutsch 1913.

350 In the Thorikos calendar, all the recipients of *trapezai* are heroines (see p. 138, n. 45 for references). On the lower status of heroines in the Athenian sacrificial calendars, see Larson 1995, 26–34.

351 For the *Heroxeinia*, see p. 136. On the *Theoxenia* at Delphi, see Bruit 1984, 363–367; Jameson 1994a, 41.

352 See above, p. 284, n. 349.

353 Pind. *Ol.* 1.90–92.

354 Thuc. 5.11; *LSS* 64, 7–22.

355 Plut. *Vit. Arist.* 21.5; Philostr. *Her.* 53.11–12. In these cases, however, the meat from the animal used for the blood ritual seems not to have been eaten by the worshippers; cf. Jameson 1994a, 39, n. 18.

356 On the effects of eating raw blood, see above, p. 249, n. 156.

357 For the burning of offerings from tables at Selinous, see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 15–16 and A 19–20; cf. the burning of the *hiera* at a regular *thysia* and the deposition of the *deipna* to Hekate, from which only the very poor ate, see Jameson 1994a, 38 and 45; Parker 1983, 347.

358 See pp. 62–71 and 254–257.

359 *Od.* 11.95–99.

360 The shades seem to have been in various degrees of need of the blood. Teiresias could talk even before he had drunk the blood, while Odysseus' mother did not recognize her son before drinking, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 81–83. For the offering of food for the purpose of necromancy, see Murray 1988, 252–253. The ordinary dead apparently suffered more under their bodily needs than the heroes. The notion of the dead as being dry and thirsty and becoming revitalized by the libations, also known from the Orphic gold leaves, seems to have concerned the ordinary dead rather than the heroes, see Vernant 1985, 334–338; Deonna 1939, 60–70 and 76–77; Zuntz 1971, 370–374 and 389.

361 Burkert 1985, 55 with n. 1, for references to the older literature. It should be pointed out that *thysia* sacrifice here means the contents of the rituals, whether or not the terms *thyein* or *thysia* are used, since *thysia* sacrifice, in the sense of alimentary sacrifice, does not necessarily have to be described by the terms *thyein* or *thysia*.

362 Burkert 1966, 104–113; Burkert 1983, 1–29; Burkert 1985, 55–59; cf. Meuli 1946.

363 Vernant 1989, 24–29 and 36–38; Vernant 1991, 279–283; Detienne 1989a; Durand 1989a; Durand 1989b; Schmitt Pantel 1992. For mutual criticism, see Burkert 1985, 4 and 217, on the structuralist approach and Vernant 1991, 279, on Burkert.

364 Burkert 1985, 57; Rudhardt 1970, 13–15; Vernant 1989, 27; Vernant 1991, 281.

365 Vernant 1989, 36–38; Vernant 1991, 280–281.

366 On the suggested similarities between funeral and sacrifice, see above, p. 240, n. 124. The dead person is rather to be likened to the animal victim at a sacrifice than to the divine recipient of the *thysia*.

367 The actual terms *thyein* and *thysia* are, as a rule, not used for the rituals performed to the ordinary Greek dead in the period under study here. The only case known to me is Ar. *Tag.* fr. 504, lines 12–13 (PCG III:2, 1984): θύομεν † αὐτοῖσι, τοῖς ἐναγίσμασιν ὥσπερ θεοῖσι. Here, however, the offerings were *enagismata* and no dining took place. In non-Greek contexts, *thyein* and *thysia* can occasionally refer to sacrifices to the ordinary dead, for example, Hdt. 3.24 (rituals of the Ethiopians); Xen. *Cyr.* 8.7.1 (sacrifices in memory of Kyros' parents).

368 Cf. the treatment of the impure Orestes at Athens, who had to eat and drink at a separate table and not be addressed by anyone, lest his impurity should spread, see Eur. *IT* 947–960; Phanodemos *FGrHist* 325 F 11; Burkert 1983, 221–222; Burkert 1985, 238–239. On the *prosphagion*, an animal that was sacrificed to the dead but did not result in any meat for the family, see above, pp. 229–230 and 256–257.

369 At least not in the case of the Tritopatores; see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 113. For discussions of the distinctions between the ordinary dead and the ancestors from a cultic perspective, see Schmidt B. 1994, 4–13 (though I disagree with his views on Greek hero-cult, see *ibid.*, 8–9 with n. 19); Hardacre 1987, 263–268, esp. 264.

370 Erchia calendar, *LS* 18, col. IV, 41–46, a sheep; Marathon calendar, *LS* 20 B, 33, a sheep, and 53–54, a *trapeza*. The sacrifices to the pure Tritopatores at Selinous (and perhaps also to the impure Tritopatores) consisted in animal sacrifice concluding with dining, even though a part of the meat was completely burnt (see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 9–17, and the discussion above, pp. 221–223). For the cult of the Tritopatores in general, see further Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, 107–113; Malkin 1987, 210–212.

371 *SEG* 30, 1980, 1119, lines 29–33; the verb used for the sacrifices is *thyein*.

372 See Hughes (forthcoming).

373 See, for example, Berthiaume 1982; Peirce 1993; Rosivach 1994; van Straten 1995.

374 See above, pp. 217–225; for the specific case of Herakles, see Verbanck-Piérard 1989; Lévêque & Verbanck-Piérard 1992.

375 Peirce 1993, *passim*; van Straten 1995, *passim*.

376 Van Straten 1995, 3–5. As regards the purification sacrifices, could some of the scenes showing piglets being carried by one hind leg, with the head facing the ground, be purification scenes? For depictions of piglets being carried (without any indications of belonging to a *thysia* context), see Durand 1986, figs. 58 and 61 (= van Straten 1995, V71 and V92); for purifications with piglets, only shown on Apulian and South Italian vases, see, for example, van Straten 1995, V411 (Orestes) and V427, fig. 1 (Proitidai?). On the purification with piglets, see also Parker 1983, 21.

377 Van Straten 1995, 3–5; for the *sphagia*, see 103–107 (esp. V147, fig. 110) and for the holocaust, see 157–158, V382, fig. 168: an Attic red-figure oinochoe from the late 5th century (Kiel B 55) showing Herakles and a youth with an oinochoe next to a low altar, on which lies a bovine skull and possibly a second animal skull. The interpretation of this scene as a holocaust depends on the skull, which has usually not been considered as belonging to the god's portion placed on the altar (*idem*, 158). The finding of skull fragments and horn cores among the bones from the altar of Poseidon at Isthmia (Gebhard & Reese forthcoming) shows that the head of the animal could form part of the god's portion as well and its presence does not necessarily indicate a holocaust.

378 Van Straten 1995, 5. Even though the *thysia* sacrifices would have given the vase-painters more scope for variation, the iconography of this ritual is limited to a few chosen moments: the *pompe*, certain preliminary rituals, the post-kill butchering and the dining; see van Straten 1995; Peirce 1993, 228; Durand 1989a; Durand 1989b. However, Herakles' funeral pyre, which was also his holocaust of himself, is shown on red-figure Athenian vases (see Boardman 1990, 128–129, nos.

2909, 2910, 2916 and 2917). An animal holocaust would presumably have had a similar appearance.

379 Durand 1986, 11; Durand 1989a, 91; Vernant 1991, 294; cf. Burkert 1966, 106; Burkert 1985, 58.

380 Henrichs 1998, 58–63; Bonnechere 1999, 21–35; cf. Lambert M. 1993, 293–311, esp. 308–309, testing Burkert's theory on Greek sacrifices against Zulu evidence.

381 Peirce 1993, *passim*.

382 Peirce 1993, 251–254.

383 Durand 1989a, 91.

384 Vernant 1989; Burkert 1985, 55–59; Durand 1989a; Detienne 1989a, 3–5; Whitehead 1986a, 205–206; Murray 1990, 5–7; Rosivach 1994, 1–4 and 11–12.

385 Durand 1989a, 103; Schmitt Pantel 1992, 49–50.

386 Though men were the principal recipients of the meat from sacrifices, there is ample evidence for women also receiving meat, either in the sanctuaries or at home, and metics and slaves could also occasionally be given meat portions, see Whitehead 1986a, 205–206; Rosivach 1994, 66–67.

387 Berthiaume 1982, 64–69; Vernant 1989, 25; Detienne 1989a, 3; Peirce 1993, 234–240; Rosivach 1994, 88; Jameson 1988, 87–88.

388 Isenberg 1975, 271–273; Berthiaume 1982, 62–70 and 81–93 (on meat from animals not ritually slaughtered); Xen. *An.* 5.3.7–10: a sacrifice to Artemis in which meat from hunted animals (from the land of the goddess) was used as a supplement to the sacrificial victims; cf. Stengel 1910, 197–201.

389 Two contemporary examples are the Jewish kosher and the Muslim *halâl* slaughter. On the non-religious character of butchering in the Christian sphere, see Himmelfmann 1997, 61–62. See also Murray 1990, 5, on the possible ritual functions of modern dining.

390 For example, Hdt. 1.126; Xen. *Mem.* 2.3.11, *An.* 6.1.2–4; Dem. *De falsa leg.* 139. Cf. Casabona 1966, 80–81, 84 and 128; Durand 1989a, 87–89; Rosivach 1994, 3, n. 5.

391 Vernant 1989, 25–26; cf. Berthiaume 1982, 62–70.

392 Rosivach 1994, 2–3 and 65–67; for a different opinion on the role of sacrificial meat in the diet, see Jameson 1988, 105–106.

393 Similarly, Jameson has shown that the local, ritual commands (demonstrated in the sacrificial calendars from the Attic demes) corresponded more or less to the seasonal supply of various animals (1988, 87–119, esp. 106).

394 Pfister 1909–12, 466 and 478–479; Rohde 1925, 140, n. 15, on the particular case of Hdt. 7.117; Meuli 1946, 208, n. 1.

395 Casabona 1966, 72–85 and 126–139 (see esp. 85, n. 23^{bis}), criticizing the position of Meuli; cf. Rudhardt 1958, 257–271. The use of the terminology in the post-Classical period is a different matter, since *thyein* was usually replaced by *thysiazein* (see Casabona 1966, 139); cf. the development of the meaning of *enagizein* outlined above, pp. 126–127.

396 Casabona 1966, 75–76, 80, 84, 126–127 and 334–336.

397LSS 19, 19–20, cf. line 79. Cf. the calendar from Marathon, LS 20 B, 2, 23 and 39.

398 Casabona 1966, 82–84 and 127–129.

399 The use of *thyein* and *thysia* for human sacrifice is in a way more understandable, since this kind of sacrifice was never performed (at least not in Greek contexts). This marks a difference from *sphagia* and similar destruction sacrifices using animal victims, which were actually executed and therefore were more likely to be described by their own particular terminology. On the terminology of human sacrifice, see Scullion 1994, 97; Henrichs 1981, 218, n. 4, and 239–240. Non-Greeks are a different matter. Herodotos describes several cases of the sacrifice and eating of humans, using *thyein* for the ritual, see Hughes 1991, 8.

400 Cf. Scullion 1994, 97, n. 57, and 117.

401 In two cases, *thyein* and *thysia* may have been used to cover a sacrifice followed by dining but modified by a blood ritual. Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* 1134b) refers to the sacrifices to Brasidas at Amphipolis simply as τὸ θύειν Βρβσίδα, while Thucydides (5.11) describes them as ὡς ἥρωί τε ἐντέμνουσι καὶ τιμὰς δεδῶκασιν ἀγῶνας καὶ ἐτησίους θυσίας. Philochoros (*FGrHist* 328 F 12) mentions the θυσίαι νηφάλιοι to Dionysos and the daughters of Erechtheus, possibly the same sacrifices as those outlined in the *Erechtheus* of Euripides (fr. 65, lines 79–86 [Austin 1968]), but there said to consist of two sets of rituals described as θυσίαισι τιμῶν καὶ σφαγαῖσι [βουκ]τόνοις and θύειν πρότομα. For these rituals, see pp. 172–175 and 183–188. There is, however, a difference in time between Thucydides and Aristotle, and between Euripides and Philochoros, and it is possible that in the 4th century the blood rituals had disappeared. The words of Philochoros are only preserved as quoted in a scholion (schol. Soph. OC 100 [Papageorgius 1888]): the original text may have contained more details.

402 Creuzer 1842, 762–769, esp. 763; Hermann 1846, 66–67. See also Schoemann 1859, 173, 212–213 and 218–219; Wassner 1883. In other contemporary studies, the distinction between hero-cult and the cult of the gods seems to be so well established that no or only very few sources needed to be presented as evidence, see, for example, Müller 1848, 288–291; Nägelsbach 1857, 104–110; Lehrs 1875, 320 and 324. It is interesting to note that Welcker (1862, 247–250, esp. 248, n. 2), though accepting a distinction between hero-cult and the cult of the gods in terminology, altars and certain rituals, argued that *enagismata* and *enagismoi* could be understood as referring to animal sacrifice, at which the meat was eaten and not burnt. Ultimately, the notion of a distinction between the rituals for heroes and for gods can be viewed as an effect of the application of the Olympian-chthonian model, see Schlesier 1991–92, 38–44, esp. 39–40.

403 To illustrate this point, see the discussion in chapter I of the terminology assumed to be particular for hero-cults. Furthermore, in some cases, the sources referred to by these early scholars do not concern hero-cults, but destruction sacrifices to other divinities. See, for example, Wassner 1883, 6, n. 5.

404 For this passage (Hdt. 2.44), see pp. 85–86 and 225–226.

405 *Bomoi* to heroes: Aias, Pind. *Ol.* 9.112; Herakleidai, Pind. *Isthm.* 4.62; Pelops, Pind. *Ol.* 1.93, cf. p. 165; Opis and Arge, Delos, Hdt. 4.35, cf. pp. 201–202; Amphiaraos, Petropoulou 1981, 49, line 26; Echelos, *LSS* 20, 6 (restored). Heroes sharing a *bomos* with a god: Semele/Dionysos, *LS* 18, col. I, 46–48; Athena Skiras/Skiros, *LSS* 19, 93. To the written sources can be added the iconographical representations of altars in hero-cults, which show no distinctions from the altars used in the cult of the gods or any indications of being used for anything other than regular *thysia*, see van Straten 1995, 165–167; Ekroth 2001.

406 Pfister 1909–12, 480–489; Rohde 1925, 140, n. 15.

407 The principle of a general category being in less need of specification than an unusual category is the basis for the division into unmarked and marked, a model which is often used in linguistics and anthropology (see Waugh 1982, with further references to Roman Jakobson) but which can also be applied to Greek sacrifices (see Nagy 1979, 308, § 10n4).

408 Thasos: *LSS* 64 = Pouilloux 1954b, no. 141. Egretes: *LS* 47 = *IG* II² 2499.

1. The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults

1

This study has had two aims, first of all, to establish the sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods and, secondly, to investigate how these rituals are to be explained and interpreted and what they can tell us about the place and function of the cult of heroes in Greek religion. The investigation has been focused on the epigraphical and literary evidence from the Archaic to early Hellenistic periods, both in defining the sacrifices to heroes and in relating them to the rituals of the gods and the ordinary dead. This chronological restriction has been considered as particularly important, since the notion that the sacrifices to heroes were distinct from the sacrifices to the gods is mainly based on Roman and Byzantine sources. The basic conclusion is that the prevalent notion of how sacrifices to heroes were performed in the Archaic to early Hellenistic periods is in need of substantial revisions.

Thysia followed by dining

2

Contrary to the previous opinion, the most frequently performed ritual in hero-cults was animal sacrifice, at which the meat was kept and eaten by the worshippers. The terminology used for these sacrifices is *thyein* and *thysia*, as well as various terms referring to the honouring of heroes. In many cases, when dining is documented,

particularly in the inscriptions, no specific term is given covering the actual sacrifice, indicating that *thysia* sacrifices were so universal that there was no need for any particular elaboration.

3

The fact that the meat was not destroyed, but kept and eaten, is clear from the direct evidence for the actual handling and division of the meat, dining facilities and references to eating. There is also a number of cases, mainly epigraphical but also literary, in which it can be argued from the contexts in which the sacrifices are found, that dining must have formed a part of the ritual. Considering the direct and circumstantial evidence for *thysia* sacrifices followed by collective dining in hero-cults, it seems safe to conclude that, when no particular details are given as to how the sacrifices were performed or in what context the sacrifices took place, the ritual was centred on the consumption of the meat from the animal victims. Furthermore, if the political, social and nutritional importance of *thysia* in Greek society is taken into consideration, it seems inconceivable that hero-sacrifices, which made up a substantial part of all sacrifices made among the Greeks, should have consisted of any other kind of ritual than sacrifices at which the worshippers consumed the meat.

4

Thysia followed by dining was the main ritual of hero-cults, just as in the cult of the gods. As divinities, the heroes occupied a similar place in the Greek religious system as the gods. This is clear, in particular, from the importance of the heroes in the sacrificial calendars as regards absolute numbers but also from the fact that they in many cases could receive just as expensive victims as the gods or even more costly animals. If compared with the ordinary dead and mortal, living men, the heroes were treated like the gods.

5

Considering the frequency of *thysia* sacrifices in hero-cults, the view of the rituals of heroes as resembling or preserving an older version of the cult of the dead can be seriously questioned. The ordinary dead may, in earlier periods, have received animal victims, and occasionally did so, even in the Archaic and Classical periods. It seems unlikely, however, that these animals were sacrificed as at a *thysia*, since the treatment of the sacrificial animal at this kind of ritual

(division, burning and consumption of specific parts) aimed at demonstrating the divine character of the recipient and distinguishing him from the mortal worshipper.

1.2. Theoxenia

6

Theoxenia rituals rarely seem to have been the main ritual performed to a hero, apart from those on the private level, in which the presentation of a table with gifts could be a less expensive alternative to *thysia*, a fact which is evident from the large number of reliefs showing such sacrifices. In the official cult, this kind of ritual often functioned as a means of substantiating a *thysia*, either by giving the same recipient an animal victim and *theoxenia* or by presenting the less important recipient, often a heroine, with a table with offerings, *trapeza*, while an animal sacrifice was performed to another, major hero. The idea of inviting and entertaining the hero was of central importance, presumably aiming at bringing the hero closer to the worshippers than was the case at a *thysia*, which in its structure underlined the distinctions between divinities and mortals. The closeness and presence of the hero may have been particularly desired on the private level, but also in state cults, as is clear from the existence of a *Heroxeinia* festival on Thasos and the use of the blood of the animal victims for inviting the hero at some public sacrifices. Even if food offerings were given to the dead, especially in connection with the burial, it is doubtful whether *theoxenia* are to be taken as indications of the connections between hero-cults and the cult of the dead, since the departed were not invited and entertained as heroes and gods receiving *theoxenia*. The widespread use of the ritual for the gods and the many similarities in its application to both heroes and gods suggests that *theoxenia* originated in the cult of the gods rather than in the rituals performed to the dead.

1.3. Blood rituals

7

Blood rituals performed in hero-cults have their own particular and varied terminology, often referring to the technical aspects of killing

and bleeding the victim: *haimakouriai*, *entemnein*, *sphagai*, *protoma* and *phonai*. Blood rituals are documented only in a few cases and were performed as the initial part of *thysia* sacrifices centred on ritual dining. At regular *thysiai*, both to heroes and to gods, the blood seems to have been kept and eaten, but at a small number of sacrifices to heroes, the *thysia* was modified by a complete discarding of the blood, presumably on the tomb of the hero. The animal may also have been killed by severing its head altogether. The notion that animals sacrificed to heroes were killed with the head turned down facing the ground can be seriously questioned, however, both from the point of view of the iconographical and the written evidence, particularly the terminology, and from the practical difficulties in slaughtering animals in that way.

8

In Greek cult in general, rituals focusing on the blood of the victims were used in a number of particular situations, such as purifications, oath-takings and battle-line *sphagia*. Here, no meal followed upon the killing of the animal, and a specific deity is rarely named as the recipient. Blood rituals could also be performed to the winds, the rivers and the sea, and in those cases, the meat from the victims was occasionally eaten. In hero-cults, most of the heroes receiving blood rituals can be demonstrated as having a particular connection with war. It is suggested that these sacrifices served as a reminder of the bloodshed on the battlefield and more directly of the battle-line *sphagia*, but also as a means of recognizing in ritual the association between these heroes and war. In these cases, the blood rituals have been transformed from an occasional ritual performed as a result of a particular situation (as was the case with the war *sphagia*) into an institutionalized practice used to modify a *thysia* ending with consumption of the victim's meat.

9

The blood rituals also seem to have had a second function in hero-cults, being used for contacting and inviting the hero and procuring his presence at the festival and games. In this respect, the blood rituals made use of the principle of *theoxenia*, but the contents and treatment of the offerings differed. The pouring out of blood to establish contact belongs to rituals connected with the sphere of the dead and the underworld. In this context, the blood could serve to

revitalize the recipient and make him approachable. Blood seems rarely to have been used in this manner in funerary cult, however. This kind of ritual is mainly evidenced as part of the sacrifices to epic and mythical characters in the literary sources, perhaps to be viewed as inspired by hero-cults but, most of all, as indicating the difference between these exceptional dead and the contemporary, ordinary dead.

10

Of relevance for the understanding of blood rituals in hero-cults is the term *bothros*, which cannot be connected with heroes before the Roman period and is therefore not to be considered as a characteristic, sacrificial installation in hero-cults. The investigation of the usage of the term *bothros* in all contexts, not only those concerning heroes, indicates that *bothroi* were predominantly used for occasional sacrifices of a private character not followed by dining, taking place outside the bounds of society and official sanctuaries and cult, and aiming at getting in contact with the beings of the underworld and propitiating them, often for a magical purpose. It is interesting to note that most contexts in which *bothroi* are referred to can be shown to be influenced by Homer's description in the *Nekyia* of Odysseus' sacrifice into a *bothros*. In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, the ritual using *bothroi* seems to have become more or less a literary *topos* and it is doubtful to what extent these sources can be taken as evidence for sacrifices of this kind actually being performed.

11

In hero-cult, however, the *bothroi* were used for actual sacrifices, at which the hero was contacted with the aid of the blood of the animal victim, but a direct use of the term in a hero-context is not to be found before Pausanias. The rituals formed part of an official cult and were usually concluded with a banquet. The use of *bothroi* for the purpose of calling and contacting a figure of the underworld is apparent from most contexts in which the term is found, no matter what the date or the recipient, and it is possible that the blood rituals to heroes outlined in the Archaic to early Hellenistic sources also made use of a *bothros*, even though such an installation is not explicitly mentioned.

1.4. Destruction sacrifices

Destruction sacrifices at which no dining took place, covered by the terms *holokautos* in the inscriptions and *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* in the literary texts, are rare and cannot be considered as the regular kind of ritual in hero-cults. All the terms seem to cover the same kind of ritual, the destruction of the offerings, but they have different bearings on the character of the recipient. *Holokautos* was more neutral, being used for both heroes and gods, while *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* are particular to hero-cults and the cult of the dead. Apart from referring to a destruction sacrifice, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos* also mark the recipient as being dead and therefore impure in some sense, and distinguish him, or a side of him, from the gods, who are immortal and pure. In most cases, the destruction sacrifices to heroes were performed as separate rituals and not in connection with a *thysia*.

The *enagizein* sacrifices seem to have been aimed at highlighting the dead and impure character of the hero. The destruction of the offerings formed part of the cult of the dead, but it is doubtful to what extent they were performed with animal victims, since the sacrifice of animals had practically disappeared from the cult of the ordinary dead already in the Archaic period, partly as a result of the funerary legislation.

Partial and total destructions of the victims are also found in the cult of the gods and can sometimes be viewed as a result of the character of the recipient, but perhaps more clearly as a reaction to or as a reminiscence of a particularly pressing and difficult situation. Similarly, in hero-cults the destruction sacrifices are not only a reflection of the recipient's character, but may also be a response to the problems and stress of a particular situation or may be performed in order to avoid difficulties in the future. Seen from this angle, these rituals were used in the same manner as in the cult of the gods.

The evidence for the terms *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos*, considered to be standard terms for the sacrifices to heroes, is slight for sacrifices to heroes in the Archaic and Classical periods (no use at all is made of the terms in inscriptions before the late 2nd century BC,

for example). More remarkable is the frequent use of the terms in the 1st to the 3rd centuries AD, particularly in the 2nd century AD and especially by Pausanias and Plutarch. The popularity of the terms during this period, evident also from the *hapax enagisterion* (attested in an inscription dating from c. AD 170), can be linked to the antiquarian tendencies of the Second Sophistic. *Enagizein* sacrifices seem to have been regarded as an old and venerable ritual, and the terms *enagizein*, *enagisma*, *enagismos* and *enagisterion* are predominantly used for heroes considered as being ancient, a tendency which may have originated in a desire to separate the old, traditional heroes of the epic and glorious past history from the more recently heroized, ordinary mortals of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. This link between heroes and *enagizein* may, in its turn, have been the reason for the almost mechanical use of *enagizein* in the scholia to explain and elucidate sacrifices to heroes in the Classical sources, whether or not these rituals contained any actions of the kind usually covered by *enagizein*. It is also interesting to note that, in the 2nd century AD and later, *enagizein* began to be used for sacrifices to gods, though often to divinities connected with the sphere of death and the underworld, and for sacrifices differing from regular *thysiai*. In this late period, the term seems gradually to have taken on the meaning “to burn completely”, no matter who was the recipient.

16

The use and meaning of the term *eschara*, which has been connected with holocaustic sacrifices to heroes, are also of significance in this context. *Eschara* can rarely be connected with hero-cults before the Hellenistic period, which is in accordance with the lack of evidence for destruction sacrifices. In the Archaic and Classical sources, the term was used as a synonym for *bomos* and, more specifically, for the separate, upper part of a *bomos*, often made of a material different from the rest of the altar (metal, clay, fireproof stone), in order to protect the stone surface from being damaged by the fire.

17

The original meaning of *eschara* being “hearth”, the term could also refer to a simple altar, located directly on the ground. In this sense, the term is found once in a hero-context in the Classical period, on a *horos* marking the *eschara* of the Herakleidai at Porto Raphti. Similarly, one of the buildings in the Archegeion on Delos was called

escharon, “a place for an *eschara*”, on account of the simple ash-altar located within this structure. An association between *escharai* and holocausts is documented only in lexis and scholia, and the *escharai* of the Herakleidae and in the Archegesion were probably used for regular *thysia* sacrifices followed by dining, especially since the term *escharon* seems to have been a local, Delian word for *hestiatorion*. Moreover, an *eschara* was not a prerequisite for holocaustic sacrifices, and smaller victims, or parts of victims, could be burnt on a *bomos*.

1

18

The notion of *eschara* as a particular altar used for holocausts in hero-cults is based on the information in the post-Classical sources and mainly the Roman and Byzantine lexicographers and commentators, as well as the scholiasts, who show certain difficulties in understanding the earlier use and meaning of the term. It is possible that a change in cult-practice had taken place after the Classical period, but the connection between *eschara*, heroes and holocausts may also be a result of the late sources attempting to separate *eschara* from *bomos* and *hestia*, and from the most frequent use of *eschara* in the Roman period, namely as a medical term referring to a wound.

19

The ritual pattern of hero-cults presented here is based on the epigraphical and literary sources dating to the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods. Instead of viewing hero-cults as opposed to the cult of the gods and dominated by destruction sacrifices, blood rituals and offerings of meals, only seldom replaced by *thysia* sacrifices followed by dining, a more varied, ritual pattern has emerged. The main ritual was animal sacrifice at which the worshippers ate, just as in the cult of the gods. This ritual could be modified by a *theoxenia* element and a different handling of the blood and the meat from the victim. Occasionally, the *thysia* was replaced by a holocaust. The possible variations are illustrated in Table 33.

Table 33. Types of sacrificial rituals in hero-cults.

Description of the ritual	Treatment of the animal victim or other offerings
<i>Thysia</i> with or without <i>biera</i> (additional non-meat gifts such as cakes, bread, fruit, vegetables)	Meat and blood eaten, as well as <i>biera</i> not burnt or left on the altar
<i>Thysia</i> modified by a <i>trapeza</i> (table with gifts)	Everything eaten: meat, blood, vegetable offerings
<i>Thysia</i> modified by <i>theoxenia</i> (preparation of couch, table with gifts and invitation to participate)	Everything eaten: meat, blood, vegetable offerings
<i>Thysia</i> modified by <i>trophosumata</i> (deposition of raw meat for the divinity, later taken by the priest)	Everything eaten: meat, blood
<i>Thysia</i> modified by a particular way of slaughtering and handling of the blood (<i>entomizein</i> , <i>baumakouria</i> , <i>sphagai</i> , <i>prokoma</i>)	Blood discarded, meat eaten
<i>Thysia</i> modified by partial destruction of the meat by burning it (<i>enakeuein</i> , etc.) or by the holocaust of another victim	A certain quantity of the meat destroyed, the rest of the meat eaten, as well as the blood
Holocausts (<i>holokautos</i> , <i>enagizein</i> , <i>enagisma</i>) performed separately from <i>thysia</i>	Blood and meat destroyed, nothing eaten

20

The traditional picture of hero-cult rituals as consisting of holocausts, libations of blood and offerings of meals, is mainly derived from the post- Classical sources, often dating to the Roman or even Byzantine periods, or from the explicatory sources, i.e., the lexicographers, the commentators, the grammarians and the scholia, the date and reliability of whom are often difficult to evaluate.

21

An investigation of the terminology considered as characteristic of heroes (*eschara*, *bothros*, *enagizein*, *enagisma* and *enagismos*) indicates that a connection between heroes and these terms can rarely be established before the Roman period. In some instances, the use and meaning of the terms have undergone substantial changes, which to a certain extent may reflect changes in the ritual practices, but, in other cases, the differences depend on the later sources not fully grasping the use and meaning of the same terms in the sources from the Archaic and Classical periods. In the case of hero-cults, it is evident that the information derived from the post-Classical sources should be used with the utmost care and, in many instances, cannot be considered as valid for the conditions in earlier periods.

22

After looking at the evidence for sacrifices in hero-cults and orienting the rituals in relation to the cult of gods and the dead, the ritual pattern of herocults will be considered both from the view-point of the Olympian-chthonian model, being particular for the Greek

evidence, and from other models, which have been applied to sacrifices in a global perspective. Finally, the role of immortality and mortality in Greek religion, and the heterogeneity of the heroes as recipients of religious attention will be discussed, in order to demonstrate the importance of these two concepts for the shaping of the sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults.

2. The Olympian-chthonian distinction

23

The Olympian-chthonian division is clearly visible in most work on Greek religion produced during the 20th century.

2

The former, stricter stance was to view the Olympian and chthonian categories as clear opposites and as more or less mutually exclusive.

3

Today, scholars tend to be less categorical, but they still adhere to the Olympian-chthonian approach. Walter Burkert, for example, separates divinities, rituals, cult-places and terminology into the two categories to emphasize this division as a fundamental trait in Greek religion but he also admits that “cultic reality, however, remained a rich conglomerate of Olympian and chthonian elements in which many more subtle gradations were possible”.

4

The validity of the Olympian-chthonian division and the dependence of ritual on the character of the recipient have recently been defended by Scott Scullion, who proposes a less strict view of what should be regarded as belonging to each category and also argues that the chthonian group should be extended to include all sacrifices in which the meat had to be consumed within the sanctuary.

5

24

Others have been more sceptical towards the Olympian-chthonian division. Arthur Darby Nock urged that the term “chthonic” should be used with caution, and a similar standpoint has been adopted by both Folkert van Straten and Kevin Clinton, in particular in dealing with the archaeological material.

6

An even more radical view has recently been put forward by Renate

Schlesier, who argues that the Olympian-chthonian dichotomy does not capture the essence of Greek religion, since it is mainly a modern, scholarly product with little support in the ancient sources.

7

25

The basic problem in applying the categories of Olympian and chthonian, not only to hero-cults, but to Greek cult in general concerns what is to be covered by each group. Since there are no direct, ancient definitions of the terms, the modern interpretations often vary from scholar to scholar and it is not evident whether the classification of a divinity as Olympian or chthonian is to be made on the basis of the character of the recipient or of the rituals performed.

8

If by chthonian is simply meant a character connected with the earth and the sphere of the dead without having any bearings on the ritual, it is possible to consider the heroes as chthonian divinities. Whether a chthonian character is to be considered as giving rise to particular rituals, is, however, another matter.

26

In the case of hero-cults, the chthonian character has usually been thought to be manifested by certain rituals, such as holocaustic sacrifices and libations of blood, as well as the use of *escharai* and *bothroi* as altars. Other particular heroic characteristics brought forward are a preference for the rituals taking place at night, the use of black victims and the killing of the animals with their heads turned towards the ground. It has often been argued that the heroes' chthonian nature is not undermined by the performance of *thysia* sacrifices, since this kind of ritual could also form part of the cult of chthonian divinities and, on the whole, *thysiai* were relatively rare in hero-cults.

9

However, the limited evidence for the use of holocaustic sacrifices, blood rituals and *escharai* or *bothroi* has removed much of the support for classifying the heroes as chthonian on the basis of the ritual. Also the validity of chthonian criteria such as the time of the day when the sacrifice was performed, the colour of the victim and the mode of killing can be seriously questioned if the evidence is more closely scrutinized. Furthermore, it has been shown in this study that *thysia* sacrifices were not rare in hero-cults, but, on the contrary, that this

was the main ritual in these cults.

27

The weak point of the Olympian-chthonian model has always been its (in) applicability to actual ritual. Even though the proponents of the Olympian-chthonian distinction admit that in the case of sacrificial ritual the division was less strict, it is questionable whether it is possible, on the one hand, to consider the Olympian-chthonian distinction as a fundamental characteristic of Greek religion and, on the other, to stress that the same distinction cannot be fully applied to ritual, since there was a great degree of variation. Sacrificial rituals have, after all, been used as one of the main characteristics in deciding whether a divinity is to be regarded as Olympian or as chthonian and they have often been considered as a direct manifestation of the character of the recipient. Furthermore, the importance of ritual actions in Greek religion is indisputable and the ritual practices must be considered as constituting the core of the religious system.

28

The discussion of the concepts Olympian and chthonian side by side in the modern literature often gives the impression that the two spheres were of equal proportions, both as to the divinities and to the rituals encompassed by each category. This has led to an over-emphasis on the spread and importance of “chthonian” rituals, especially destruction sacrifices, which have usually been regarded as the chthonian ritual *par excellence*, when, in fact, this kind of ritual is much less frequently documented than *thysia*, its Olympian counterpart, no matter who the recipient. While epithets such as *Chthonios* and *Chthonia* demonstrate the presence of chthonian divinities in Greek religion, the existence of chthonian rituals can be seriously questioned.

10

2.1. Ou phora

29

In Scott Scullion’s revised definition of Olympian and chthonian, attempting to demonstrate the applicability of the two categories also to ritual, the chthonian category has been extended to include not

only sacrifices at which the victim was destroyed, but also all sacrifices from which the meat could not be carried away and had to be consumed on the spot, usually designated as *ou phora*.

11

All divinities receiving such sacrifices are considered as being chthonian and the prescribed dining in the sanctuary a manifestation of their chthonian character. Furthermore, Scullion suggests that these “on-the-spot” meals were often connected with a partial destruction of the victim’s flesh, an action for which he suggests the convenient term *moirocaust*.

12

30

When applying this revised definition to hero-cults, however, Scullion has not taken the bulk of the evidence into consideration, nor the local variations. To mention a few examples, he includes the Erchia calendar, since it contains *ou phora* stipulations, but he does not comment upon the implications of his theory for the heroes mentioned in the Thorikos calendar. This latter inscription includes one holocaust (to a god), the presence of which can be taken as support for the interpretation of all other unspecified sacrifices in this calendar being *thysia* followed by dining, whether the recipients were heroes or gods.

13

Furthermore, the meat from one of the hero-sacrifices in this calendar was apparently sold and cannot therefore have been eaten on the spot.

14

Scullion’s classification of the sacrifices mentioned in the Salaminioi calendar as “on the spot” meals is also doubtful, since the meat from the victims supplied by the state or by individual members was to be divided raw between the two groups of Salaminioi.

15

Similarly, Herakles is considered as the best example of a divinity being simultaneously Olympian and chthonian, the mixed character being reflected in the rituals.

16

Still, if such character traits are to be considered as being of central importance, it has to be explained why the chthonian side was scarcely ever acted out in the sacrificial rituals.

17

A further problem with this extension of the chthonian sphere is that few deities are left outside of it: Apollon, Artemis, Zeus, Hera, Poseidon, Dionysos and Athena, or at least various aspects of these deities, become chthonian if the *ou phora* command is taken as a manifestation of the chthonian character of the recipient. Moreover, taking a connection with the earth as the main criterion for designating a divinity as chthonian also widens this category of gods to more or less the whole pantheon.

18

Another difficulty in interpreting the ritual practices as a sign of the chthonian character of the recipient concerns the question whether a regulation about the *worshippers'* handling of the meat can actually be said to have any bearing on the character of the recipient. Apart from the *ou phora* and holocausts, Scullion also considers wineless sacrifices, *nephalia*, as chthonian. Wineless sacrifices only concern the deity's part of the sacrifice, while *ou phora* concerns the worshippers' share of the victim. Holocausts concern both the deity and the worshippers, since the whole animal was consecrated to the divinity and no meat fell to the participants. Is it possible to define the chthonian nature of the recipient by combining one ritual command explicitly regarding the deity's part of the sacrifice (*nephaios*), a second ritual command explicitly concerning the worshippers' part of the sacrifice (dining *ou phora*) and a third command affecting both the deity and the worshippers (holocausts)? It has often been pointed out that the deity's involvement in the sacrifice ceased after the sacrificial fire had been extinguished with the wine-water libation.

19

The gods did not dine with the worshippers, they received their part of the sacrifice first and, when the worshippers had their share, the divinity was no longer present.

20

Therefore, it is questionable to what extent the *ou phora* stipulation, which concerns the handling of the meat after the deity has received his share of the victim, can be considered as related to the character of the recipient.

The main objection, however, against accepting the "on-the-spot"

meals as a sign of the chthonian character of the deities receiving these sacrifices is related to the practical implications of this command. It has been demonstrated beyond any doubt, most of all by the archaeological material, that ritual meals in sanctuaries are to be considered as a main feature of Greek cult.

21

At some sites, facilities for feasting may even have been constructed before any kind of temple was erected and a recent study has shown that one of the important functions of the stoas, found both in sanctuaries and in public areas, was to be used for ritual dining.

22

The fact that the worshippers ate in the sanctuary cannot by itself be considered as a distinguishing criterion between chthonian and Olympian rituals.

34

If the *ou phora* command is to be interpreted in the sense Scullion suggests, it has to be assumed that the worshippers made a distinction between, on the one hand, dining taking place in a sanctuary, since there was an *ou phora* command, and, on the other, eating there voluntarily, perhaps since there were suitable dining facilities or they were far away from home. To support such a notion, Scullion proposes that the chthonian “on-the-spot” dining is to be considered as being set in a constrained environment and in a gloomy atmosphere, which was only accepted since it was a better alternative than a holocaust, giving no room for any ritual meals at all.

23

If Scullion’s interpretation is followed, the “on-the-spot” meals seem to have worked as a means to force the worshippers to eat in the sanctuary, although they would rather eat at home.

35

For the argument to carry, it has to be assumed, first of all, that chthonian shrines, including those of the heroes, were locations having an uncanny, negative atmosphere. There is no direct contemporary evidence supporting this conception and to illustrate the atmosphere and the context of the *ou phora* sacrifices, Scullion refers to a passage from the Orphic *Lithika* concerning a ritual performed to Helios and Ge by three young men, who sacrifice a snake and dine on it.

24

The use of this passage as comparison is highly questionable, considering its late date, the 2nd century AD or even latter part of the 4th century, and the fact that the text deals with the theurgical and magical manipulation of stones, a ritual far removed from the public state and deme cults of the Classical period, which Scullion attempts to elucidate.

25

The atmosphere of the sacrifice in the *Lithika* rather has a lot in common with the magic rituals performed at *bothroi*, mainly evidenced in the Roman sources: a sacrifice in secrecy with a magic purpose involving few participants, unusual offerings (in this case, a snake), the abandonment of parts of the offerings on the site of the sacrifice, care taken not to look back when leaving the site.

26

36

Secondly, the basic ritual of hero-cults, as well as chthonian cult in general, has to be considered as being a holocaust, which was circumvented by the *ou phora* stipulation and the consumption of the meat in the sanctuary. It would be a different matter, could it be shown that all these the “on-the-spot” recipients usually, or at least frequently, received holocausts. The *ou phora* command could, in that case, be taken as a way of modifying a holocaust, shifting it towards a regular *thysia*. In the majority of the instances, however, the opposite seems to be the case and we seem rather to be dealing with regular *thysia* sacrifices which have been modified as being *ou phora*.

37

In a later study, Scullion has argued that the “on-the-spot” meals were frequently accompanied by *moirocausts* and that sacrifices to heroes not being specified as holocausts were probably *moirocausts* rather than regular *thysiai*.

27

However, the connection between any form of *ou phora* stipulation and partial destruction of the meat from the animal rests on rather weak ground. The only indisputable case is the sacrifice to Zeus Meilichios in the Selinous sacred law, at which a thigh of the victim was to be burnt and the meat could not be removed.

28

The second possible case referred to by Scullion, the *enateuein* sacrifice to Semele in the Mykonos calendar, is less certain. This can

only be taken to be a combination of a moirocaust with an “on-the-spot” prescription if the command δαινύσθων αὐτοῦ (to be eaten here) concerning the sacrifice performed on the following day to another divinity is considered as also referring to Semele.

29

Apart from these two cases, the moirocausts at *ou phora* sacrifices to heroes, and to other divinities as well, remain an inference. More compelling is the fact that the explicitly clear moirocaust to the impure Tritopatores in the Selinous inscription, which is said to be executed “as to the heroes”, is not specified as being “on-the-spot”. Furthermore, none of the other known moirocausts, which on the whole are few and mainly concern gods, show any indication of the consumption of the meat being regulated in any way.

30

To consider the Selinous *lex sacra* as a support for moirocausts being common seems therefore to be pressing the evidence too far. Most commentators agree on this inscription being created as the response to some kind of crisis, in the form of pollution stemming from civil war, ineffective funerary rites, disease, infertility or the fear of ghosts.

31

Destruction sacrifices, of the kind often labelled *heilige Handlungen*, were one kind of ritual used to deal with such conditions.

32

The possibility has, at least, to be considered that the Selinous inscription does not reflect any regular cult activity, but rather constitutes the ritual response to a situation of stress, and is therefore not to be taken as an example of ritual practices at large in the Greek world.

38

On the whole, the heroes seem to fit less well into the modified version of the Olympian-chthonian model than do the chthonian gods. Even though Scullion’s starting-point is that ritual dining was a rare feature of herocults, he admits, at the same time, that the heroes received such sacrifices more frequently than chthonian divinities at large, a fact he explains with the heroes being more approachable than other chthonians.

33

There are, however, other indications of the heroes not conforming

to the chthonian pattern. *Nephalia*, wineless sacrifices, often taken as a sign of chthonian ritual, are rare in hero-cults.

34

To consider *ou phora* sacrifices as a ritual particular for hero-cults is questionable, since most sacrifices to heroes show no sign of having been regulated in this manner. Furthermore, it is also interesting to note that of the divinities, for whom this stipulation is known, only nine are heroes while 35 are gods. The suggestion that meat could perhaps never be taken away from sacrifices to heroes is contradicted by at least two cases where meat was removed to be eaten or sold.

35

The majority of the evidence for moirocausts concerns gods and not heroes and the only indisputable case of the combination of a moirocaust and an *ou phora* stipulation does not concern a hero but a god.

36

Deviations such as these from the assumed chthonian ritual pattern for the heroes raise further doubts of the applicability of the Olympian-chthonian model, even in its modified version, to sacrificial rituals.

39

Scullion's explanation of the *ou phora* stipulation is based on the notion that the chthonian nature or character of the recipient was decisive for the occurrence of this command. The conclusion seems unavoidable, however, that the chthonian rituals resulted in the same activity as the Olympian ones, namely that the worshippers dined in the sanctuary. This being the case, the *ou phora* stipulation seems to lose some of its force as a marker of the recipient's character. The distinctions claimed to separate the "on the spot" dining from the voluntary feasting in sanctuaries, such as the *ou phora* sacrifices taking place in a gloomy and constrained environment, often being accompanied by moirocausts and only accepted, since they at least give the worshippers some meat to dine on, can rarely be demonstrated in the available evidence. The alternative course of action suggested here, is therefore to approach the *ou phora* command from the ritual point of view, starting with the stipulation itself and take a closer look at how it functioned within its own context.

40

If we begin with the tangible results of an *ou phora* stipulation, it is clear that it meant that the worshippers actually ate the meat in the sanctuary instead of taking their portions with them to prepare and consume them at home or perhaps to sell them. For some reason, it was desired that those who participated in the sacrifice remained in the sanctuary also for those parts of the ritual which did not have to be executed there, contrary to the killing of the victim, burning of the god's portion and grilling of the *splanchna*. Since dining can be said to form an integrated part of the ritual of animal sacrifice, the consumption of meat on the spot can be seen as a way of prolonging the ritual sequence. In a way, this may have meant an emphasis on the religious aspect of this meal. In this sense, it is possible to compare prescribed feasting in a sanctuary with *theoxenia*, one function of which, Michael Jameson has suggested, was to give the whole *thysia* ceremony more weight and getting the participants more involved in the sacrifice.

37

The practice of *trapezomata*, the deposition on a table within the sanctuary of raw meat, which was subsequently taken by the priest, is also of interest in this context, since it may have functioned in a similar manner.

38

No carrying away of the meat, *theoxenia* and *trapezomata* all emphasized the alimentary aspect of the sacrifice but also made the food and the worshippers remain for a longer time in the sanctuary. It is of interest to note that both the Thorikos and the Marathon calendars list *trapezai* among the expenses for sacrifices but that none of these inscriptions contain any references to *ou phora* or similar practices.

39

The Erchia calendar, on the other hand, has no *trapezai* but 22 cases of *ou phora*.

40

This may be a coincidence but perhaps the two rituals had, in some way or to some extent, a similar content and function, for example, the prescribed dining within the sanctuary also involving cooked or raw meat being displayed along the lines of the practices of *theoxenia*/*trapezai* or *trapezomata*.

41

A sacrificial calendar from Kos is also of interest here, since, at a sacrifice of a heifer to Hera, it is stipulated that the meat could be taken away while portions of intestines and bread, clearly priestly perquisites, had to remain in the *naos*.

42

These latter offerings were to be sacrificed on the hearth in the temple and simply may have been deposited there or perhaps burnt. The prescription against removing the meat or the demand that the meat had to be eaten in the sanctuary seems, however, to have worked independently from the cutting of *gera* reserved for the priest or priestess.

43

41

Thus, prescribed dining in the sanctuary may have functioned as a way of prolonging, strengthening and emphasizing the religious aspect of animal sacrifice and the following meal, as well as the worshippers' involvement in the ritual. Why was this desired on certain occasions? Here, several possibilities can be thought of. If we look at the evidence for *ou phora*, more than two thirds of the cases are found in a total of only three inscriptions: the sacrificial calendars from the deme Erchia, from Mykonos and from Kos. All three of these can be put in connection with a recodification or reorganization of the ritual activity at each location, which in its turn was brought about by some kind of changes having taken place, either within the cult itself or in the surrounding society. At Erchia, a new system for meeting the costs of the sacrifices was probably the main reason that called for the calendar to be inscribed.

44

The Mykonos calendar explicitly states that it was written down after the synoecism of the island in order to record new sacrifices and changes in the old rituals.

45

The Coan calendar also came about after the synoecism in 366 BC.

46

In fact, most of the remaining inscriptions containing *ou phora* regulations can also be linked to external or internal changes affecting the cults, for example, two cults merging into one, a private cult being transferred to the public domain, the control of the sanctuary changing hands from one state to another.

In all, the number of cases in which connection between *ou phora* and some kind of change can be established seems to be too great for it to be dismissed as being entirely coincidental.

In situations of change, there may have been a desire to emphasize or promote certain cults by ensuring that a larger number of participants were actually present in the sanctuary, something which was accomplished by making the worshippers consume the meat on the spot. One reason for doing so, may have been that a cult had been moved. In the Erchian calendar, every single sacrifice has the location indicated. This feature, unique for this kind of document, has been suggested to be a result of some sacrifices having changed locations and perhaps also being administered by the deme rather than by a *genos*.

This calendar also contains 22 cases of the *ou phora* command, constituting almost half of the extant evidence for this kind of regulation. It is tempting to trace a connection between the high number of *ou phora* regulations and the fact that the locations are given for all the sacrifices. To make the worshippers actually feast on the spot and to prohibit the meat from being removed, may have been a way to establish new traditions of these particular sacrifices at those specific cult places, as well as to make them familiar to the public.

After a synoecism, certain divinities may have been given a different and perhaps more significant role.

To take another example from the Erchia calendar, this document contains a low number of sacrifices to heroes if compared with the other well-preserved calendars from Attica.

Of the eleven sacrifices to heroes in this calendar, however, seven are marked as *ou phora* (the remaining cases being three holocausts and one *thysia* not specified in any way). If the Erchian calendar marked a reorganization of the deme's cults due to financial difficulties, it is possible that some hero-cults may have been left out in order to save

money.

52

If that was the case, the importance of the remaining hero-cults may have been stressed by the “on-the-spot” meals.

53

44

In connection with this line of thought, it is interesting to consider who the divinities are who receive these sacrifices. Scullion considers them all chthonian and in many cases a connection with the earth, the land, or a specific locality is obvious. At changes affecting the society, it may have been of interest to strengthen and emphasize cults having a close relation to the actual region or city where one lived. One way to accomplish this could have been to regulate where the meat from these sacrifices could be consumed, in the sanctuary or elsewhere. In the Coan calendars, for example, the meat from certain sacrifices to Zeus Polieus, Zeus Ourios and Apollon Dalios could not be taken outside the city or even outside the island.

54

The prominence of *ou phora* sacrifices to Zeus Polieus may, therefore, perhaps be due to his close link with the city and the polis rather than to him being “chthonian” in the sense Scullion advocates.

55

45

To regulate where the meat could be taken and consumed could also have functioned as a way of marking who belonged to a certain group or context and who was excluded. The *ou phora* command, as well as other commands in the same sense, are found in combination with other regulations concerning the handling of the meat and who were allowed to participate.

56

In the Mykonos calendar, for example, the *ou phora* sacrifices to Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonie were also specified as being closed to foreigners or outsiders.

57

If these divinities were of special importance for the links to the land and the territory, dining within the sanctuary could have been a way not just to underline this particular relationship but also to control who were to participate and thereby exclude the foreigners or outsiders more effectively. The reason for making the sacrifice to the

Archegetes in the same calendar, another cult with strong local colour, an “on-the-spot” meal may also have been to exclude those who were not considered appropriate participants.

58

In both these instances, these were sacrifices for the inhabitants of the island and connected with the land itself. To emphasize this fact, the dining was to be performed in the sanctuary.

46

Women were banned from the sacrifices to Athana Apotropaia and Zeus Apotropaios on Rhodes, at which the meat could not be removed.

59

An *ou phora* command goes well with such a regulation, since the fact that the men actually had to eat all the meat in the sanctuary definitely excluded the women from any participation, accidental or deliberate. Thus, it is possible that the *ou phora* command in some cases was used to reinforce a restriction concerning who could participate and more precisely, who could not. There are other, similar cases. A presumably private shrine and *temenos* of Asklepios and Hygieia somewhere in Attica was only accessible to farmers and those living nearby and the meat from the victims could not be removed.

60

Some of the meat, however, had to be given to the person who had set up the shrine, as well as to the religious official, probably the priest. A regulation of cult of the Ὑλλέων Νύμφαι on Thera prohibits the meat from being carried away.

61

The inscription was cut in the rock, presumably at the site where the sacrifices and the dining were to be performed. This cult may have been reserved for the members of this tribe, and their eating on the spot further indicated this exclusivity. It is interesting to note that at the *ou phora* sacrifice to Zeus Meilichios in the Selinous *lex sacra*, it is stated that the person performing the sacrifice may invite whomever he wishes.

62

Perhaps this latter stipulation also functioned as a way of selecting the participants at this meal within the sanctuary, though the criteria for selection were here dependent on the initiator of the sacrifice and

may have varied from occasion to occasion.

63

47

If the dining took place in the sanctuary, it may have facilitated the exclusion of those who were not to have access to the meat. At the same time, the prohibition of removal of meat may have been a way of assuring that a particular category of worshippers actually received their allotted share. At the sacrifice to Dionysos Bakcheus on Mykonos, the *hieropoioi* were to pay for the victim, a goat, and participate in the dining, which had to be performed on the spot.

64

In this case, the *hieropoioi*'s access to the meat they had paid for was assured by the inscription stating both that they were to take part in the meal and that the feasting was to take place in the sanctuary. Three of the cases of meat being given to a certain group of participants in the Erchia calendar are combined with *ou phora*. In two cases, at the combined sacrifices to Semele and Dionysos, it is the women who are to receive the meat.

65

The consumption on the spot may have served as a guarantee for them to be able to enjoy this meal. The third case of *ou phora* in connection with meat consumption in this calendar concerns the Pythaistai, who were to be given meat at a sacrifice to Apollon as well as at two other sacrifices to the same god, at which no further restrictions are indicated.

66

It is interesting to note, that the *ou phora* command at this first sacrifice to Apollon involving meat distribution to the Pythaistai has been added to the stone after the inscription was cut.

67

Perhaps this was a later measure taken to ensure that this group should be able to get the meat.

48

To sum up, as a ritual regulation the *ou phora* command may have functioned on various levels and been used to achieve different, though often associated, purposes. Consumption of the meat in a sanctuary can be seen as a way of emphasizing the religious aspect of the meal and of connecting the worshippers more closely to the cult place and the divinity, but also to each other. In this sense, the *ou*

phora command is not unique but may be compared to *theoxenia* and *trapezomata* rituals. Feasting at a certain location could have been desired for a number of reasons, particularly as a means of enhancing the importance of some sacrifices in connection with changes in the society or the cult itself. At the same time, regulations of where the meat was to be eaten may have been used to mark who belonged to a particular category or group but they also facilitated the distribution to those who were entitled to a share on a particular occasion.

3. *Thysia* and powerful actions: low-intensity and high-intensity rituals

49

It has been argued here that the definition of the heroes as chthonian (even in its modified version) is not compatible with the evidence, since the rituals performed in hero-cults are predominantly of the kind that would be considered Olympian if the Olympian-chthonian distinction were to be applied. Furthermore, holocausts, blood rituals and the offerings of meals, usually regarded as chthonian sacrifices, are also found in the cult of the gods or in contexts in which no particular recipient is specified. The random application of the label chthonian to everything that has to do with hero-cults serves more to obscure than to elucidate the heroes and their sacrificial rituals.

50

Since one of the aims of this study has been to demonstrate the difficulties in using the Olympian-chthonian model to understand sacrificial rituals and, in particular, the rituals practised in hero-cults, it is interesting to see to what extent other models of sacrifice may be applied to the Greek rituals, in particular those of the heroes. Among other approaches to Greek ritual in recent years is the view of the sacrifices as consisting of, on the one hand, the “normal” kind of sacrifice, usually labelled *thysia*, and, on the other, a variety of “powerful actions”, which could be used to modify or colour the *thysia*, depending on the purpose and context of the ritual.

68

These “powerful actions” could consist in choosing an animal of unusual character (black, not castrated, pregnant) or pouring out

libations of a of kind different from wine mixed with water (honey, milk, water, unmixed wine). Most frequently, the powerful actions concern the treatment of the meat from the victim, resulting in its partial or total destruction. In his important paper on hero-cults, Nock distinguished between two kinds of holocausts, first of all, offerings to persons who have lived and died and who need sustenance, and secondly, actions labelled as *heilige Handlungen*, rituals performed as a reaction to the situation rather than to the character of the recipient. Among these, Nock included the deposition of pigs in the *megara* at the Thesmophoria, sacrifices of puppies to Enyalios, purifications, *sphagia* in general, oath-sacrifices, offerings of victims in a crisis, cathartic sacrifices and various ceremonies to avert evil.

69

The main distinction between this manner of approaching Greek religion and the Olympian-chthonian approach lies in the former model's focus on ritual, an aspect that has always been played down in the latter approach.

51

The model of the sacrificial rituals as being mainly *thysia*, modified by powerful actions on certain occasions, is, in fact, not unique and has parallels in the study of sacrifices globally. A closer look at models of sacrifices in other cultures and contexts is therefore of interest in order to demonstrate that the Olympian-chthonian approach is far from the only option when studying the Greek evidence. Jameson's view of sacrifices as usually being of the normal kind, occasionally modified or replaced by powerful actions or *heilige Handlungen*, can, for example, be compared with Henninger's division into *regular* and *extraordinary* sacrifices.

70

According to this division, the regular sacrifices are determined by the astronomical and vegetative year, annual commemorations of historical events and important occasions in the life of the individual, such as birth, puberty, marriage and death. Extraordinary sacrifices, on the other hand, are performed at special occurrences in the life of the community or the individual, both of a joyous and a disastrous kind.

52

A classification, perhaps fitting the Greek evidence better, has been made by van Baal following Platvoet, who based his observations on African material.

71

According to differences in the religious situation, van Baal divides the sacrifices into *low-intensity* and *high-intensity rites*. Low-intensity rites are the ideal form for man's relation with the supernatural and encompass what is done on a regular basis for the upkeep of the order and when nothing particular has occurred. These simple rites are sufficient to keep up good relations with the gods, inspiring confidence in their benevolence and protection. The high-intensity rites are performed when disasters and misfortune persuade the faithful that there is something wrong with these relations. These are special situations that demand special actions.

53

The understanding of Greek sacrificial ritual as consisting mainly in *thysiai*, at which the worshippers ate, and rarely *heilige Handlungen* or "powerful actions" is to regard the situation in which the sacrifices were performed, and not the character of the recipient, as decisive for the ritual. The whole system is based on one kind of standard behaviour regulating matters when conditions are normal. Therefore, most sacrifices were *thysiai*, low-intensity rituals, dealing with the day-to-day contact with the divine sphere, no matter whether the recipients were heroes or gods. On the other side of the spectrum are the *heilige Handlungen*: total or partial destruction of the victim and an emphasis on the animal's blood. Such rituals can also be found both in hero-cults and in the cult of the gods but are, on the whole, rare for both kinds of recipients. In some cases of *heilige Handlungen* (such as purifications, oath-takings and war *sphagia*), no divine recipient was named and it has been suggested that these rituals are not even to be considered as sacrifices.

72

If the sacrificial rituals of hero-cults are considered from the point of view of low-intensity and high-intensity rituals, it is obvious that the cult of the heroes concurs with the cult of the gods and that the sacrifices to heroes fulfilled the same function as those to the gods.

54

If *thysia* sacrifices were so intimately linked with Greek society,

dining and the procuring of meat, why were rituals performed at all, which focused exclusively on the blood of the victim or at which some, or all, of the meat was destroyed? If sacrifices to the divinities are aimed at helping men and regulating their world, it would theoretically be sufficient to perform such sacrifices and no difficulties would occur. Still, all religious systems seem to have had a need for some kind of sacrifices deviating from the usual practices, to be used in particular situations, and often such rituals involved the destruction of the offerings.

73

The principle at work seems to have been that of renunciation: if a part is given up, the rest could be saved.

74

This behaviour functions as a last resort in unusual, extreme and unexpected situations, not covered by the regular, ongoing cult, and is a manifestation of the religious system being prepared for all eventualities.

75

The intimate link between the situation and the performance of such sacrifices makes it understandable that, in many cases, at least in the Greek evidence, no particular divinity was named as recipient.

55

In all, high-intensity rituals must be considered to be rare, no matter what the cultural context.

76

This is an important observation which, in the Greek case, is easily obscured if the Olympian-chthonian model is applied, since from this model it is all too often taken for granted that all chthonian divinities received destruction sacrifices or other kinds of high-intensity rituals. Each sacrificial system is of course a product of its own specific cultural context and comparisons with other religions have to be made with care. However, if the traditional view of Greek sacrifices is followed and all chthonians are to be considered as receiving particular rituals, for example holocausts, moirocausts or offerings of blood, this would mean that Greek religion would have occupied a more or less unique position among cultures practising animal sacrifice. In no other context, in which animal sacrifice forms a regular part of the ritual practices, do destruction sacrifices seem to make up more than a small fraction of the rituals performed. On the

whole, it may be argued that sacrifices resulting in an unusually large part of the victim being destroyed, or a complete holocaust, are unusual, since they were only needed occasionally. Furthermore, these rituals were meant to deal with the difficulties of particular situations. They would lose their distinctive meaning and also their power to deal with the stress and danger of a specific situation, were they to be performed on a regular basis.

56

Still, the division into low-intensity and high-intensity rituals and their respective links with regular cult and occasional demands for particular actions does not fully reflect the possible variations in the Greek evidence (see Table 33, p. 309). Destruction lies at the heart also of a regular *thysia* sacrifice, since it cannot be accomplished without the burning of the divinity's portion of the victim, a partial destruction which, however, does not affect the share of the animal falling to the worshippers. Moreover, it is interesting to note that the *heilige Handlungen* can be disconnected from the occasional use corresponding to a particular situation and instead form part of a regular cult to a particular divinity. In these cases, the ritual may have begun as a response to a particular situation demanding high-intensity rituals, but the ritual came to be performed on a recurrent basis. As such, the ritual may serve as a reminder of the cult originally having been instituted to deal with a particular situation, but the performance of high-intensity rituals on a regular basis can also be seen as an attempt to control in advance through sacrifices a potentially difficult situation.

57

The same ritual action can be given different functions and meanings depending on its context and periodicity. To illustrate the variety of the Greek evidence, it may be useful to distinguish a third category of rituals, besides the low-intensity and the high-intensity rituals (Table 34). This third category makes use of the rituals belonging to the high-intensity category, but they are performed on a regular basis and are used to modify ordinary, low-intensity sacrifices. The blood rituals to the heroes, as well as most cases of destruction sacrifices to heroes and to the gods, can be placed in this third category.

Low-intensity rituals	High-intensity rituals	Modified rituals
• <i>Thysia</i> • <i>Theoxenia</i> • Cult of the dead	• Battle-line <i>sphagia</i> • Oath takings • Purifications in connection with singular events, such as murders • Rites of crossing • Holocausts to Eubroetis to ward off hunger and to Zeus Meilichios to procure funds	• Blood rituals in hero-cults • <i>Enagizein</i> to the Phokaians • Holocausts in the sacrificial calendars • Partial or total destructions to Herakles • <i>Enateuein</i> sacrifices • Purifications on a regular basis, e.g., of temples and the assembly

58

Seen from this angle, the modified rituals, i.e., the high-intensity rituals performed on a regular basis often as a part of low-intensity rituals, can be considered as corresponding to the character of the recipient or to a particular side or aspect of his character, more than to the situation. In some cases, the ritual may originally have been a response to the situation, such as the *enagizein* sacrifices to the Phokaians killed at Agylla, but the ritual continued to be performed as a part of the regular cult. In the case of the blood rituals performed in hero-cults, the treatment of the blood in the high-intensity ritual of battle-line *sphagia* was incorporated into a *thysia* followed by dining as a reminiscence of some of these recipients having a connection with war. At the same time, the blood rituals were used when inviting the hero and to procure his presence at a festival. Therefore, it is possible to view the modified rituals as a means of recognizing in ritual the character of the recipient or a particular side of the recipient's character.

59

Thus, on the whole, it is possible to understand Greek sacrifices in general, and those to heroes in particular, in another manner than by the Olympian-chthonian distinction. The model of sacrifices as consisting mainly of low-intensity rituals and occasionally of high-intensity or modified rituals fits the ritual pattern of hero-cults and seen from this view, the heroes have the same ritual pattern as the gods. The linking of the high-intensity rituals to a particular situation is less evident in hero-cults and therefore the connection between the character of the heroes and the performance of such rituals needs to be further explored.

4. Immortality-mortality

The heroes are dead, a fact which distinguishes them from the gods. Still, the heroes are not on the same level as the ordinary dead. The heroes are not as impure, since their graves can be placed in the sanctuaries of the gods. They can interfere with the living and are not confined to a powerless existence in Hades. The question is to what extent the fact that the heroes were dead affected the ritual practices.

In order to understand better the character of the heroes in relation to the ordinary dead and the gods respectively, Greek religion can be imagined as being based on three major components: gods, heroes and the dead. The gods are the highest, most universal and powerful, while the dead are the lowest, locally confined and in possession of the least power. In between the gods and the dead can be placed the heroes.

It is important to stress, however, that gods, heroes and the dead are all linked to each other. Each group cannot be treated as a clear-cut, welldefined entity. Rather, a spectrum has to be imagined, shifting from gods at one end to the dead at the other. The slide from one side of the spectrum to the other may be better understood, if each god, hero and deceased person is imagined as being made up of two parts, not necessarily of the same size. Thus, it is possible to picture their relationship in the following manner.



Some gods are all divine, while others are more related to the heroes. Some heroes have clear traits of gods in them. Other heroes are closer to the ordinary dead and the fact that they are dead is considered as

being of central importance. Inherent both in gods, heroes and the ordinary dead is a certain degree of immortality and mortality, and it is the relation between these two components that distinguishes a god from a hero and a hero from a deceased person. A true god is, of course, immortal and shuns death; still, Zeus, Dionysos and other gods are known to have had graves, according to some traditions.

77

Herakles and Asklepios were born as mortal men but were after their deaths counted among the gods. A deceased person is dead but is still regarded as having a kind of existence, whether in Hades or in the tomb. Ordinary mortals can transcend the deceased state and be raised to the rank of heroes after death.

64

To illustrate further this relationship between gods, heroes and ordinary dead, the concepts of immortality and mortality, as well as the categories of *thysia* and *enagizein* sacrifices, can be added to the model. The terms *thysia* and *enagizein* are of particular interest, since it is clear that the latter carried with it a reference to the recipient actually being dead and functioned as a marker of the recipient's mortality, especially in such cases when the two terms were contrasted. Mortality and *enagizein* sacrifices are used from the "bottom" up, i.e., for the dead and the heroes, but never for the gods. The heroes are thus located in the middle, between the gods and the dead, having a share of both immortality and mortality, a position which affects the sacrificial rituals. They therefore receive both *thysia* and *enagizein* sacrifices.

IMMORTALITY	THYSIA	God/God		
IMMORTALITY	THYSIA	God/Hero		
IMMORTALITY	THYSIA	Hero/Hero	ENAGIZEIN	MORTALITY
		Hero/Deceased	ENAGIZEIN	MORTALITY
		Deceased/Deceased	ENAGIZEIN	MORTALITY

65

The major distinction, however, seems to have been the divide between gods and the deceased, rather than between gods and heroes or heroes and the deceased. In a way, this may seem obvious, since the gods and the deceased are the furthest apart, but this is an important characteristic of Greek religion.

78

For example, the priestess at Delphi wavered as to whether to

proclaim Lykourgos a god or a man, but finally deemed him to be the latter (Δίζω ἢ σε θεὸν μαντεύσομαι ἢ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον θεὸν ἔλπομαι, ὦ Λυκόοργε).

79

The people of Elea sought advice from Xenophanes, whether or not they were to sacrifice and sing dirges to Leukothea (εἰ θύωσι τῇ Λευκοθέᾳ καὶ θρηνῶσιν, ἦ μὴ), and received the answer that, if they believed her to be a goddess, they were not to lament her, but, if they believed her to be a mortal, they were not to sacrifice to her.

80

66

It was essential to draw the line between the divine and the human sphere, to distinguish between immortality and mortality. The heroes, being mortals who received cult and were equipped with powers going beyond those of the ordinary dead, had a share in both categories. Still, rituals connected with the mortal side of the hero can rarely be documented and the fact that the hero was dead seems to have been of surprisingly little concern in hero-cults.

67

For example, *enagizein* and *enateuein* sacrifices, which can be taken as a special marker of the mortal and impure character of the recipient, in particular as a contrast to the pure and the immortal, were rarely used in hero-cults. Moreover, both heroes and gods were given sacrifices designated by the term *holokautos* and, as far as can be ascertained, the rituals covered by *enagizein* and *holokautos* both meant a total destruction of the offerings, which in the cases of heroes and gods were performed with animal victims. Partial destructions of the victims are also found in the cult of the gods and may, in fact, have amounted to more or less the same quantity as the meat destroyed at the *enateuein* sacrifices.

81

Also the complete discarding of the animal's blood, aiming at revitalizing the recipient and making him approachable, can be seen as a ritual concerning, in particular, the dead side of the hero, but such rituals were apparently only considered as necessary for a small number of sacrifices to heroes and for a particular purpose.

68

Why the mortal character of the hero was marked in some cases, but not in the majority of hero-sacrifices, is difficult to say, since the

sources do not provide the necessary information. The impurity stemming from death may have been felt more strongly in the cases of some heroes and led to the total abandoning of the offerings, just as in the cult of the dead. Some heroes had died a violent death at an early age and may have been considered as *biaiothanatoi*, a fate which could have given them extraordinary powers but which also made them angry and led to their having to be placated, presumably by destruction sacrifices.

82

On the other hand, although the heroes could be the givers of good things, they also seem to have had a negative, angry and dangerous side, which is documented, already in the 5th-century sources.

83

To what extent this side or character trait may have called for particular ritual practices is difficult to say.

69

The mythical background of the hero might also have affected the ritual, as in the case of Herakles, who began as a mortal who died but was finally elevated to a god. The *enagizein* sacrifices may have marked his starting-point as a mortal, but this particular character trait was of no great interest, since these sacrifices can rarely be documented in his cult.

84

In most cases, it seems to have been sufficient to evoke his mortal origin in myth without having to act it out also in ritual.

70

If necessary, the distinctions between gods and heroes relating to their immortal and mortal characters could have been demonstrated in other ways than by the contents of the actual sacrifices. The dead character of the hero must have been evident from his having a tomb or a cenotaph, which in most cases led to a local confinement of the cult or at least not to a pan-Hellenic spread (even though many minor gods and goddesses also were only worshipped locally). Other means of marking the particular character of the hero could have been by lamentations for his death.

85

Athletic contests, even when held in honour of a god, were often associated with a hero and considered as connected with the games performed at his funeral.

Any distinctions between heroes and gods could also have been manifested by the temporal relation that the cult of the hero had with that of a god. The general notion that sacrifices to heroes functioned as a *Voropfer* in relation to the main religious event, the sacrifice to the god, can, however, be demonstrated only in a small number of cases, mainly found in later literary sources.

It remains possible that the fact that the hero was dead was in itself not considered as being of central importance.

5. The heterogeneity of heroes

The scant attention paid to the dead character of the heroes in cult and the limited extent to which the hero's mortality can be demonstrated as reflected in the actual sacrificial rituals contradict the traditional notion of hero-cults as connected with the cult of the dead and the sacrificial rituals performed to heroes as a development or reminiscence of the practices of tomb-cult. The fact that *thysia* sacrifices followed by dining can be shown to have been the principal ritual in hero-cults constitutes a further objection to the belief that hero-cults originated in the cult of the dead and preserved particular traits of such cult.

Of relevance for the understanding of the sacrificial rituals in herocults is the fact that the heroes form a highly mixed group, to a large extent depending on the varying origins of different heroes.

The complex question of the origin of hero-cults at large cannot, of course, be fully explored here, but a few remarks as to the origins should be made, since the background of the heroes is pertinent to the understanding of the rituals and any connections with the cult of the dead.

As early as in the Archaic period, a substantial distinction between the rituals used in the cult of the dead and in hero-cults can be discerned and the written evidence suggests conscious attempts to

limit the scope of both the funerary rituals and the monuments for the dead, a process which continues in the Classical period.

90

If hero-cults are to preserve the rituals of the cult of the dead, it has to be the rituals used in the funerary cult of a distant past, i.e., a period about which we have very little information. The extant descriptions, for example, the burial of Patroklos in the *Iliad*, may have been influenced by contemporary practices used in hero-cults or simply constitute a mixture of both.

91

It is possible that the rituals performed at the burials of exceptional individuals and the subsequent tending of their graves can have inspired hero-cults or even developed into hero-cults, but also in this case the reverse process may have occurred.

92

74

Of great interest for the theory of hero-cults as originating in the cult of the dead is the concept of the dead in antiquity, especially in the Homeric period, which would have been the time when the hero-cults were developing.

93

The dead in general in the Homeric epics are passive, unreachable and have no individual destiny. These powerless dead, not being given any particular attention after death, are unlikely candidates for the origin of the heroes who received cults. A select few, however, gained immortality and the idea of someone occasionally not sharing the common fate of the Homeric dead may be put in connection with the rise of hero-cults.

94

The fact that it is emphasized that these fortunate individuals became immortal instead of dying, i.e., that they were distanced from the ordinary dead, is to be noted.

95

These exceptional characters are linked to the divine sphere rather than to the realm of the ordinary mortals and, if they are to be considered as a source of inspiration for the hero-cults, it is by no means surprising that the ritual practices of hero-cults do not correspond to the rituals performed for the ordinary dead.

75

The former idea that the hero-cults had been inherited from the Bronze Age and had been continuously practised all through the Dark Ages has now been definitely abandoned, mainly because the later activity at the Bronze Age tombs can in no case be shown to be the traces of a continuous attention from the Bronze Age into the Iron Age.

96

Furthermore, the latest work on the Iron Age material in Bronze Age tombs has demonstrated that the later activity at these tombs cannot universally be considered as the remains of hero-cults, since the material comprises later burials, re-use for non-religious purposes and dumping of waste, as well as the deliberate deposition of offerings.

97

Moreover, within the material likely to represent some kind of deliberate attention, there is great differentiation, ranging from a few pots to whole deposits spanning several centuries, and perhaps only the major deposits are to be regarded as the remains of cult.

98

To exclude completely the possibility that the Geometric and Archaic material in the Bronze Age tombs represents the remains of early hero-cults, the conclusion drawn by Antonaccio, seems too drastic.

99

76

Still, Antonaccio's questioning of the Iron Age deposits at the Bronze Age tombs as the remains of hero-cults raises the interesting question whether early hero-cults were dependent on actual graves and to what extent it is possible to disconnect the hero-cults from the cult of the dead. Her main argument for the disassociation of heroes and graves is the fact that the documented cults of epic heroes, arising in the 8th and 7th centuries BC, are not located at Bronze Age tombs, but only at other Bronze Age remains.

100

Therefore, even though the tomb of the hero was important for the cult, it is possible that the significance of older graves for the establishment of hero-cults has been overestimated.

101

The fact that the hero was honoured by a cult may have been sufficient to make him friendly disposed towards the living and

whether this cult was focused on the hero's tomb, his cenotaph or any other remains or objects connected with him may have been of less importance.

102

77

The view of the heroes and, in particular, their sacrificial rituals, as deriving from the cult of the dead, is a result of considering Greek religion as partly consisting of an older, pre-Greek stratum, to which belong the rituals and beliefs connected with the dead, the heroes and the gods of the underworld.

103

This older stratum was later overlaid by the Olympian religion, but traces of it can still be discerned in, for example, hero-cults. Several objections can be raised against this evolutionistic perspective, above all, when applied to hero-cults.

104

If hero-cults are to preserve rituals used in an older kind of funerary cult, the heroes must be an old feature of Greek religion. This is not necessarily the case, at least not with all hero-cults.

78

The cults of heroes at Bronze Age tombs and the establishment of cults of heroes mentioned in Homer both concern "old" heroes, deriving from mythology and epic. It is clear, however, that some categories of heroes were new creations of the Geometric and Archaic periods, i.e., cults established to the contemporary dead, not mythical or epic characters. One such, important, new category of heroes is the oikists, who were neither associated with the Bronze Age nor connected with graves or other remains from this period.

105

Considering the early institution of some of these cults, as early as the mid 8th century BC, it is possible that they, in fact, influenced or even gave rise to hero-cults in the motherland.

106

79

Another category of new hero-cults is the cult of the war dead, which can be linked to the rise of the hoplite armies of the Archaic period. The origins of these cults are more difficult to date precisely and they are definitely later than the oikist cults. A particular treatment of the war dead can be discerned in the 6th century, though there is no

direct information as to the sacrificial practices in this early period.

107

Since both the oikists and the war dead were given hero-status by their contemporaries, it must have been of essential interest to distinguish these heroes from the ordinary dead. One way of doing so was by adopting the sacrificial rituals used in the cult of the gods also for these heroes: animal sacrifices followed by dining for the participants.

108

The cults of the oikists and the war dead were of the same essential concern to society as the cult of the gods and fulfilled the same functions. Therefore, it is not surprising that the rituals were to a large extent the same as those for the gods and emphasized the collective nature of these cults. In the case of the war dead, the fact that they were dead is often played down by the sources and instead their immortal nature is underlined: this can also be seen as a way of distancing these heroes from the ordinary dead.

109

The ritual practices of these cults may have influenced the sacrificial rituals of hero-cults at large. The funerary legislation of the Archaic period may be considered as a further attempt to distinguish between new heroes and contemporary dead by suppressing such traits in the funerary cult as also existed in hero-cult, for example, animal sacrifice.

110

80

Different hero-cults came into being (and also disappeared) continuously all through the Archaic and Classical periods.

111

Even though some hero-cults, for example, the Menelaion or the cults of the oikists in the colonies, began in the 8th century, hero-cults do not seem to have become a prominent feature in Greek religion until the Archaic period.

112

The earliest written evidence for hero-cults offers, of course, only a *terminus ante quem*, but it is interesting to note that heroes rarely figure in the earliest epigraphical material, unlike the gods and the ordinary dead.

113

81

In fact, it seems impossible to pin down the origin of hero-cults, as such, and therefore, it is more relevant to consider the rise of the category of “hero”.

114

A number of factors contributed to the origin and development of hero-cults and the rituals used, not at least social and political changes.

115

The colonisation and the development of the Greek city-state created the need for new treatments of founders and prominent soldiers after they had died, in order to distinguish them from the ordinary dead. Changes in the attitudes towards the dead in general may also have contributed.

116

In the Archaic period, there are signs of the dead being perceived as dangerous and having to be averted, which led to the creation of new methods in dealing with them, a development that may have constituted a further reason for linking the heroes to the gods rather than to the ordinary dead.

117

In all, hero-cults may be seen as one manifestation of the increased complexity and the higher degree of specialization which Greek religion seems to have undergone from the Early Iron Age down to the Classical period, as regarded different kinds of divinities, rituals, votives and sanctuaries alike.

118

82

The variations in the sacrificial practices must be seen against the mixed background of the heroes. Certain hero-cults may be derived from the interest in ancient graves and the tending of the graves of important individuals, and some rituals can perhaps be connected with the practices of the cult of the dead in the distant past, even though our sources can rarely verify or falsify such an assumption. On the whole, however, when the category of “heroes” gradually appeared, it had to be orientated to relation to the already existing cults of the gods and of the dead. There was no interest in connecting the heroes with the ordinary mortals, rather a separation from the cult of the dead was desired: therefore hero-cults adopted the rituals of the cult of the gods.

6. Conclusion

83

The basic ritual in hero-cults was a sacrifice at which the worshippers ate. This ritual could occasionally be modified according to the needs of a particular occasion or in a particular cult as a response to the character of the recipient. These modifications show a great degree of variation as regards the actual actions, for example, the presentation of a table with offerings, a total discarding of the blood of the victim or a partial or total destruction of the meat, and even finer variations were surely possible (see Table 33, p. 309). Most hero-cults, however, contained no such ritual modifications: the worshippers sacrificed and ate, just as in the cult of the gods. The heroes cannot be understood as a category ritually isolated from the gods, as has often been done previously. Also conceptually, even though the heroes were dead, they must in many ways have been perceived as being similar to the gods. In Greek society and within the religious system, the heroes fulfilled the same role as the gods and therefore they were given *thysiai*.

84

The reason why the *thysiai* were modified can be sought both in the situation in which the sacrifices were performed and the purpose of the ritual on that occasion, as well as in the character of the recipient. To consider the character of the recipient as the main decisive factor for the ritual, as the advocates of the Olympian-chthonian approach do, is not compatible with the evidence for the hero-cults. The character may result in particular rituals, but, since the main ritual in hero-cults was *thysia* sacrifice followed by dining, the conclusion concerning the ritual would be that the heroes were Olympian. The rituals have rather to be considered within a wider context.

85

One and the same ritual may have had more than one origin. The burning of the animal victims, the discarding of the blood and the use of offerings to invite the recipient can be connected with similar rituals, alike in the cult of the gods, in funerary cults and in rituals of the *heilige Handlungen* kind, the latter usually having no recipient. At the same time, the performance of such actions may also have had

more than one function and express more than one side of the recipient. On the whole, however, the fact that the hero was dead seems to have been of little importance for the sacrificial rituals. Ritually speaking, the heroes belonged with the gods.

Notes

1 This is clear from an extensive sacred law from Kos, dated to the mid 4th century BC, which stipulates a holocaust of a piglet and its *splanchna* on a *bomos*: τοὶ δὲ [ἡράναιες κ] ἀρπῶντι τὸν μὲν χοῖ[ρον] καὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ, LS 151 A, 32–33. To clarify the question of which kinds of altars were required for holocausts and *thysiai*, respectively, practical experiments are needed (cf. the experiments with ox-tails and gall-bladders performed by Michael Jameson 1986, 60–61 and figs. 3–4). It seems questionable whether it was possible to holocaust a substantial victim, such as an ox or a full-grown sheep, on a *bomos*. To create enough heat and draught, a construction over a pit seems more plausible; cf. the pits in the *enagisterion* at Isthmia (see pp. 80–81 for references). Such practical considerations may also have guided the organization of the *kathagizein* sacrifice to Asklepios at Titane, in the Argolid, at which the larger animals, such as a bull, a lamb and a pig, were wholly burnt on the ground, while the small victims, the birds, were burnt on the altar (Paus. 2.11.7).

2 Most of all in the scholarship in the German philological tradition (see Schlesier 1991–92, 38–44 and refs. in p. 215, n. 2). The almost complete absence of the terms Olympian and chthonian in the work on Greek religion done by the structuralists of the Paris school is interesting; see, for example, Vernant 1990, 101–119; Vernant 1991, 290–302; Detienne 1989a, 1–20. This is surely related to the view of the function of sacrifice held by these scholars: sacrifice defines man's place in the universe as being distinguished from those of the gods and the beasts by their various eating modes. Cf. also Hubert & Mauss (1964, 9–18), who view all sacrifices as consecrations at which the victims were destroyed, either by consumption by the worshippers or by being handed over completely to the god.

3 Wide 1907; Stengel 1910, 126–133; Stengel 1920, 105–155; Harrison 1922, 1–31; Rohde 1925, 116 and 158–160; Ziehen 1939, 579–627, esp. 598. See also the 19th-century scholarship referred to on pp. 296–297.

4 Burkert 1985, 202, cf. 428, n. 8; cf. Burkert 1966, 103–104; Burkert 1983, 9, n. 41; Henrichs 1991, 162–163.

5 Scullion 1994, 75–119; Scullion 2000, 163–167.

6 Nock 1944, 576, n. 3; van Straten 1995, 167; Clinton 1992, 61; Clinton 1996, 168–169, esp. n. 39; cf. Pirenne-Delforge 2001, 132–134.

7 Schlesier 1991–92, 38–51.

8 For an overview, see Schlesier 1991–92; *OCD*³ s.v. chthonian gods.

9 See, for example, Scullion 1994, 98–99 and 101, who bases his opinions on dining in hero-cults on Nock (“Nock’s canonical list”).

10 The Olympian-chthonian distinction was the subject of a seminar in Gothenburg in April 1997. Many of the presented papers expressed doubts about the existence of Olympian and chthonian sacrificial rituals, even though the ancient sources mention Olympian and chthonian gods, see, for example, Parker (forthcoming).

11 Scullion 1994, 98–119.

12 Scullion 2000, 165–166. *Moirocaust* is not known from any ancient source but the term is a well-found description of the ritual referred to.

13 See the discussion of this calendar above, pp. 158–159.

14 Daux 1983, line 27, Νεανίαι τέλεον, Πυανοψίοις, π[ρατόν]. For the reading π[ρατόν], see Parker 1987, 146.

15 Scullion 1994, 114, n. 128; *LSS* 19, 19–24. Furthermore, contrary to Scullion’s claims, Ferguson (1938, 33–34) in his commentary explicitly says that the this meat was *not* eaten on the spot but carried away.

16 Scullion 1994, 90–91.

17 For the evidence, see Verbanck-Piérard 1989; Bergquist (forthcoming).

18 This is the argument usually presented against the categories of Olympian and chthonian: most divinities do, in fact, have a chthonian aspect (see Clinton 1996, 168–169, n. 39; cf. *OCD*³ s.v. chthonian gods).

19 See above, p. 287, n. 364.

20 The aim of the dining at the *thysia* was collective sharing among men, not among men and gods; see Burkert 1985, 57; Vernant 1989, 24–29; Vernant 1991, 291. Cf. the institution of sacrifice by Prometheus as a means of separating gods and men, as described in the *Theogony* and *Works and Days*; see Rudhardt 1970, 13–15; Vernant 1989, 26–35.

21 See, for example, the material treated by Bergquist 1990, esp. 57–61; Cooper & Morris 1990, 66–85; Bookidis 1990, 86–94; Tomlinson 1990, 95–101; Schmitt Pantel 1992, 304–333 and Appendix 4; cf. Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 390–392, for the Early Iron Age evidence. On Greek sanctuaries being planned for accommodating a large number of worshippers dining out in the open, see Sinn 1992, 180–187.

22 The earliest building in the Herakleion on Thasos may have functioned as a dining room rather than as a temple, see Bergquist 1998, 57–72. On the function of the stoas, see Kuhn 1985, 226–269.

23 Scullion 1994, 101 and 105–106.

24 Scullion 1994, 105–106.

25 For the date of the *Lithika*, see West 1983, 36; Halleux & Schamps 1985, 57. For the contents, see Keydell 1942, 1338–1341; Halleux & Schamps 1985, 4–45.

26 See above, pp. 62–71.

27 Scullion 2000, 165–166.

28 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 17–20.

29LS 96,22-26, ἐνδεκάτηι, ἐπὶ το(ῦ)τ[ο] πληθος, Σεμέληι ἐτήσιον τοῦτο ἐνατεύεται δυωδεκάτηι Διονύσῳ Ληνεῖ ἐτήσιον ὑπὲ [ρ] κα[ρ]πῶν Διὶ Χθονίῳ, Γῇ Χθονίῃ δερτὰ μέλανα ἐτήσι[α] ' ξένῳι οὐ θέμις δαινύσθων αὐτοῦ; The sacrifice to Semele takes place on the eleventh of Lenaios (lines 22–24). The next day (lines 24–26), Dionysos Leneus, Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonie all receive sacrifices. The “to be eaten here” stipulation follows after the last two divinities (line 26). Scullion (2000, 165–166) considers all these three deities part of one complex, to which Semele also can be added, and therefore any ritual commands at the end of the sequence can be taken to apply to all four of them. However, a distinctive punctuation is used to separate the events on the twelfth, i.e., the sacrifices to Dionysos Leneus from the sacrifices to Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonie, the latter also being forbidden to outsiders, see Butz 1996, 91. Furthermore, if δαινύσθων αὐτοῦ is to cover the sacrifice to Semele, the conclusion must be that the ban on *xenoi* also concerns this sacrifice. This causes a difficulty, since the sacrifice to Semele is specified as being accessible to the public, ἐπὶ το(ῦ)τ[ο] πληθος, see further above, p. 220, n. 27.

30 For the evidence, see above, pp. 217–225.

31 See above, p. 227, n. 62.

32 See examples discussed above, pp. 226–227.

33 Scullion 1994, 114–117.

34 See Henrichs 1983, 98–99; cf. Scullion 1994, 103.

35 Scullion 1994, 114; Parker (forthcoming). For the removal of meat, see above, p. 313, n. 14, Neanias at Thorikos, and the heroes mentioned in the calendar of the *genos* of the Salaminioi. Of interest is also LS 151 A α τῶν θυομένων τῇ Λευκοθῇ ἀποφορὰ ἐς ἰέρεαν. It should be noted that information stating that the meat was removed is rare in the Greek evidence, no matter the divinity concerned.

36 See above, pp. 316–317.

37 Jameson 1994a, 53–57.

38 Jameson 1994a, 56–57. Jameson actually makes a comparison between *theoxenia*, *ou phora* and *trapezomata*.

39 See above, p. 138 and 156, Table 25.

40 See above, p. 156, Table 25.

41 The Selinous *lex sacra* contains one of the few cases of a sacrifice at which a *theoxenia* ritual and a prohibition of the removal of the meat are found together, see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 17–20, τοῖ ἐν Εὐθυδάμῳ : Μιλιχίοι : κριδὼν θ[υ]όντο. ἔστο δὲ καὶ θῦμα πεδὰ ρέτος θύεν. τὰ δὲ ἡπαρὰ δαμόσια ἐξή<α>ρέτο καὶ τρά[πεζα]ν : προθέμεν καὶ οολέαν καὶ τὰπὸ τᾶς τραπέζας : ἀπάργματα καὶ τὸστέα κα [τα] νᾶαι τα κρᾶ μέχφερέτο. καλέτο [η]όντινα λέι. At this sacrifice to Zeus Meilichios, the thigh of the ram, offerings from the table

and the bones are said to be burnt. Perhaps the *kra mechphereto* is there to clarify that the rest of the meat on the table was to be eaten (and also used as perquisites for the priest)? *LSA* 43 (2nd century BC), concerning the cult of Sarapis at Magnesia, specifies that while the sacrificed victims had to be consumed on the spot (line 7), a leg of each victim had to be left in the *temenos* as well as three portions of meat (lines 10–12). These latter may have been used for some kind of *trapezomata* ritual and subsequently fell to the priest, constituting his *gera*.

42 *LS* 151 B, 7–10, θύει ιαρεύς καὶ ιερὰ παρέχει. γέρη λαμβά[νει] δέρμα καὶ σκέλος - ταύτας ἀποφορὰ ἔνδον ἐνδέρεται, καὶ θύε[ται] ἐπὶ τῇ ἱστίᾳ. ἐν τῷ. ναῶι τὰ ἔνδον καὶ ἐλάτῃ ἐξ ἡμιέκτου [σπ]υρῶν τούτων οὐκ ἐκφορὰ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ. This case, incidentally, is interpreted by Scullion (1994, 104, n. 82) as being without ritual significance.

43 Many inscriptions stipulate both the prohibition of removing meat and which kind of *gera* the priest is to receive, see, for example, *LS* 151 A, 45–46; A, 57–59; D, 1–3; Petropoulou 1981, 49, lines 31–36 (= *LS* 69); *LS* 54. It is not clear whether the *ou phora* command applied also to the priest's portion. See also *LS* 28 = *IG* II² 1356, separately listing the *hierosyna* for certain priestesses (consisting of money, skins and various kinds of food) and the parts of the sacrificial victims they could take from the table; see also discussion of this and other cases in Gill 1991, 15–19.

44 The main argument for this theory is the division of the sacrifices into five columns, each with more or less the same cost, see Daux 1963a, 632–633; Dow 1965, 210–213; Dow 1968, 182–183. On the relation between this calendar entitled *Demarchia he mezon* and the presumed “Lesser Demarchia”, either older or contemporary, see above, p. 151, n. 120 and p. 163.

45 *LS* 96, 3–5. No earlier calendars are known from Mykonos, which means that the extent of the religious changes is unknown. For evidence for the political changes, see Butz 1996, 88, n. 64.

46 *LS* 151, commentary by Sokolowski; Sherwin-White 1978, 292–293, who also comments on the almost total lack of evidence for religion on Kos before the synoecism. Cf. *LS* 156 and 157 which also have been put in connection with the synoecism.

47 Cults of Zeus Apotropaïos and Athana Apotropaia united under a single priestess (*LSS* 88 b, Lindos, 3rd century BC, cf. commentary by Sokolowski); joining of the cult of Zeus Polieus and that of the Twelve Gods (*LS* 156, Kos, 300–250 BC); cult of Sarapis being taken over by the state (*LSA* 43, Magnesia, 2nd century BC, cf. commentary by Sokolowski); the control of the Amphiareion at Oropos having passed from Athens to Boiotia (Petropoulou 1981, 49 [= *LS* 69], Oropos, early or late 4th century BC?; on the disputed dating of this text, see *SEG* 31, 1981, 416; *SEG* 38, 1988, 386; Parker 1996, 148–149 with n. 108; Knoepfler 1986, 96, n. 116; Knoepfler 1992, 452, no. 78).

48 Dow 1965, 212–213.

49 If the locations of the sacrifices in the Erchia calendar are considered, most sanctuaries house both such sacrifices at which the meat could be taken away and

such at which the dining had to be on the spot. One sanctuary, however, has only *ou phora* sacrifices: the sacrifices to Kourotrophos and Artemis on the 21st of Metageitnion ἐς Ζωτιδῶν “in the plot or precinct of the Sotidai” (LS 18, col. III, 3–12), perhaps a *temenos* consecrated by a local family, the Sotidai; cf. Daux 1963a, 624. Cf. the only *ou phora* sacrifice in the sacred law from Selinous being to Zeus Meilichios in the plot or sanctuary of Euthydamos (τῶι ἐν Εὐτυδάμο : Μιλίχιοι), see Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 17 and 20, cf. *idem*, 27–28 and 37. For Euthydamos being a hero rather than the progenitor of a gentilitial group, see Clinton 1996, 165.

50 Cf. Sherwin-White 1978, 292 and 299–302. Apollon Dalios and Apollon Pythios were two traditional Coan cults apparently given continuity in the religion of the new state. Also Leto was of major importance in the 3rd century BC. Both Apollon Dalios and Leto were given *ou phora* sacrifices, see LS 151D, 2 and 4. On the position of Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonie in connection with the reorganization of the polis on Mykonos, see Butz 1996, 89–92 and 94.

51 For the evidence, see above, pp. 161–163.

52 See above, p. 163.

53 Only one of the hero-sacrifices is not marked as being *ou phora* in contrast to the sacrifices to the gods, of which half are *ou phora* and half lack such a stipulation. There is also one holocaust to a god.

54LS 151 A, 54–55, meat from the ox sacrificed to Zeus Polieus not to be taken outside the city; LS 156 B, 13 and 16, meat from animals sacrificed to Zeus Ourios and Apollon Dalios not to be taken outside the island of Kos. Cf. LS 96, 6–7, Mykonos, the ram sacrificed to Poseidon Temenites not to be brought into the city. Could this have been a way of promoting a rural, local cult of this god?

55 On the connections between the polis and Zeus Polieus (as well as other divinities concerned with the identity and protection of the polis), see Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 307–312.

56 On the use and function of the prohibition of *xenoi* in religious contexts, see the discussion by Butz 1996, 75–95, who argues that this restriction was used as a means of defining the polis.

57LS 96, 24–26; see also Butz 1996, 89–92

58LS 96, 40–41, the lines being very fragmentary; for the command δαινύσ[θων αὐτοῦ], see Syll3 1024, 40–41. The damaged part of the stone may perhaps have contained a ban on *xenoi* to participate also in this sacrifice (see Butz, 1996, 91 with n. 69), cf. the Delian cult of the Heros Archegetes or Anios, at which the entrances to the sanctuary, consisting of the *escharon* and the *oikoi*, had inscriptions stating ἔξῃωι οὐχ ὅση ἐσιέναι, see the detailed discussion by Butz 1994, 69–98, esp. 83–94; see also *supra*, pp. 36–38. Butz suggests that the prohibition at Delos aimed at excluding Athenians from this indigenous cult. The meat from the sacrifices to the Heros Archegetes at Tronis described by Pausanias (10.4.10) had to be consumed on the spot and this ritual may also be placed in the same category.

59LS 88 a, 3–6 (4th century BC), Athena Apotropaia, and b, 4–6 (2nd century BC), Athena Apotropaia and Zeus Apotropaios.

60LS 54, 1st century AD.

61LS 132, 3; 4th century BC. On the meaning of Ὑλλέων, see commentary by Sokolowski.

62 Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 17–[20, esp. line 20, τὰ κρᾶ μέχφερέτο. καλέτο [h]όντινα λεί

63 On the linking of the prohibition of removing the meat and the freedom to summon guests, see also Clinton 1996, 173–174. It may also be possible that “he may invite whomever he wishes” meant the opposite, that is, even though this was an *ou phora* ritual, this particular sacrifice could be open to anyone.

64LS 96, 26–30.

65LS 18, col. I, 46–51 and col. IV, 35–40.

66LS 18, col. V, 33–38; col. II, 47–51; col. III, 33–37.

67 For this instance of *ou phora*, see Daux 1963a, 612 and 628, col. V, 36–38 (see also the Appendix, p. 351), since it is not included in Sokolowski’s edition of the text (LS 18). There are two more cases of *ou phora* being added later to this calendar (Daux 1963a, 628, col. II, 44 and 59, the recipients being the Herakleidai and Aglauros). These two additions of *ou phora* are, in fact, the only two cases of this command in the whole second column and are perhaps to be seen as corrections, since they were forgotten when the stone was inscribed in the first place. The other four columns have between four and six instances of *ou phora* each (see Dow 1963a, 204).

68 Jameson 1965, 162–163; cf. Peirce 1993; Verbanck-Piéard 2000, 283–284.

69 Nock 1944, 590–591.

70 Henninger 1987, 548–550.

71 Van Baal 1976, 168–169; Platvoet 1982, 27–28, has elaborated further on the same classification.

72 Durand 1989a, 91; cf. Casabona 1966, 165. Still, they are religious actions performed in order to achieve a certain purpose in relation to the supernatural sphere.

73 The Nuer in Sudan performed sacrifices at which the victim was not eaten, in order to stay plague or murrain, to make certain birds leave the grain alone and in war, in front of the advancing army (see Evans-Pritchard 1956, 219–229). Among the Dinka, an animal may be trampled to death as a preparation of war, while purification from incest could be achieved by cutting a ram in half while alive and sometimes discarding the meat, see Lienhardt 1961, 285 and 306–307.

74 Burkert 1987, 44–46. Versnel 1981, 184–185, suggests that *all* sacrifices that force people to renounce a possession, to eliminate it from society, to destroy, kill, spill, bury or burn it, are motivated by the same feeling of compulsion that payment has to be made and compensation provided; cf. Gladigow 1984.

75 As Walter Burkert writes, “Every religion aspires to the absolute. Its claims, when seen from within, make it self-sufficient. It establishes and explains but needs

no explanation" (1983, xx).

76 On destruction sacrifices among the Nuer and the Dinka, see above, p. 327, n. 73; see also van Baal 1976, 173, on the rare cases of holocausts among the Southern Toradja in East Indonesia; cf. Leach 1976, 83–84; Seiwert 1998, 276, on a part of the victim regularly being given back to the worshippers at animal sacrifice. The daily holocausts in the Temple at Jerusalem constitute an exception. This was the only, or at least, the principal location at which Hebrew sacrifices were performed, at least from the Hellenistic period until the destruction of the Temple (see Ringgren 1982, 143–149 and 295–296; Burkert 1985, 63). Cf. the statement by Porphyrios (*Abst.* 2.26.1–2), referring to Theophrastos (fr. 13, Pötscher 1964; cf. Bernays 1866, 111–113), that, if the Greeks were to be ordered to sacrifice in the same manner as the Syrians and the Jews, they would cease doing it altogether, since the former do not eat the victims sacrificed but burn them completely (εἰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμᾶς <τρόπον τις> κελεύοι θύειν, ἀποσταίημεν ἂν τῆς πράξεως. Οὐ γὰρ ἐσιτώμενοι τῶν τυθέντων, ὀλοκαυτοῦντες δὲ ταῦτα).

77 On gods fleeing death, see, for example, Artemis leaving the dying Hippolytos, *Eur. Hipp.* 1437–1439; cf. Parker 1983, 33 and 37; Burkert 1985, 201–203. For the tombs of gods, see Pfister 1909–12, 385–397; Fontenrose 1960, 211, n. 32; for the tomb of Zeus, see also Kokolakis 1995, 123–138.

78 Burkert 1985, 201–202. For the gods' fear of death, see *supra*, n. 77.

79 Hdt. 1.65.

80 Arist. *Rh.* 1400b. For a similar separation, cf. *Pl. Resp.* 427b; *Pl. Leg.* 717a–b; *Contr. Macart.* 66.

81 In the Selinous sacred law, the thigh of the ram sacrificed to Zeus Meilichios is to be burnt (Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993, A 19–20). The meat from the back leg of a modern sheep makes up about one-tenth of the whole animal, while if the bones are not removed, the weight of the leg constitutes one-sixth of the weight of the entire animal (according to an experienced French butcher). The burning of the thigh may therefore not have constituted a substantial difference from the *enateuein* sacrifices.

82 Seaford 1994, 123–139; Van Hoof 1991, 161; Nilsson 1967, 183. Johnston 1999, 71–80, 129–139 and 153–155, suggests that the installation of a cult may have appeased the anger of the *biaiothanatoi* and that certain rituals, which have been interpreted as purifications may, in fact, have served as appeasements. The preferred choice for the deposition of lead curse-tablets seems to have been the tombs of those who had died young, been executed or perished by violent means, since it was believed that these deceased had special powers to fulfil the curses of the tablets, see Jordan 1985, 152–153; Gager 1992, 19. Holocausts were also used in magical contexts (see Graf 1991, 195–196).

83 See, for example, *Ar. Av.* 1490–1493, on the hero Orestes; *Ar. Her.* fr. 322 (*PCG* III:2, 1984), the heroes as the guardians of bad and good things; *Hippoc. Morb. sacr.* (Littré 1839–61, vol. 6, 362) on the heroes as senders of diseases; *Men. Synpheboi* fr. 459

(Edmunds 1961); cf. Henrichs 1991, 192–193; Johnston 1999, 147, n. 24 and 153–154.

84 The mortal side of Herakles was clearly more emphasized in myth than in cult, since in cult Herakles was principally a god, see Verbanck-Piérard 1989, 44–49. Cf. Henrichs 1991, 195–196, on the dangerous and malevolent side of certain divinities being relegated to myth while the helpful and friendly side was emphasized and acted out in cult.

85 Seaford 1994, 139–142; Alexiou 1974, *passim*, esp. 55–62; Nilsson 1967, 187. On the importance of lamentation in the ritual behaviour towards the ordinary dead, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 177.

86 Seaford 1994, 120–123; Roller 1981.

87 For the *Voropfer* theory, see Rohde 1925, 113, n. 46; Eitrem 1915, 468; Nilsson 1906, 454; Henrichs 1984, 258 with n. 9; Kearns 1992, 81. The examples usually brought forward are Paus. 5.13.3 (Pelops and Zeus) and Paus. 3.19.3 (Hyakinthos and Apollon) to which can be added Paus. 9.29.6 (Linos and the Muses) and Plut. *Vit. Thes.* 4.1 (Konnidias and Theseus). In many other cases, it seems to have been more important to begin with the most powerful divine being, the god, passing in descending order *daimones*, heroes, the ordinary dead and occasionally also the living (Pl. *Resp.* 427b; Pl. *Leg.* 717a–b; *Mund.* 400b; *Contr. Macart.* 66; Aesch. *Epig.* fr. 55 [Nauck 1889]; Ar. *Av.* 866–887). In the inscriptions, heroes and gods are either mixed or the sacrifices to the gods precede those to the heroes, but to what extent this reflects the order in which the actual sacrifices were carried out is hard to say in most cases (*LS* 18, col. I, 46–51, sacrifice to Semele on the 16th of Elaphebolion ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βωμοῦ as the sacrifice to Dionysos, col. IV, 35–40; *LSS* 19, lines 89–90, sacrifices to Poseidon, Heros Phaiax, Heros Teukros and Heros Nauseiros and line 92, to Athena Skiras and Skiros; *LSS* 10 A, 60–74, sacrifices to Themis, Zeus Herkeios, Demeter, Pherrephatte, Eumolpos, Heros Melichos, Archegetes, Polyxenos, Threptos, Dioklos and Keleos; cf. *LS* 4, 3–5; *LS* 5, 36–39; *LSS* 13, 17–23; *IG* II² 140, 17–23).

88 An explicit distinction between the sacrificial practices of the heroes and those of the gods seems to be a development that took place after the Classical period and is probably best seen as a result of the changes that the hero concept underwent in the Hellenistic period and later. Heroes and gods seem to have drifted apart, ritually speaking. Arrianos (*Anab.* 4.11.2–3), for example, mentions Kallisthenes telling Alexander, in a context in which the latter wanted to be a god, that the honours of men and of gods should be distinct, that all gods are not honoured in the same way and that there are also different honours for the heroes, distinct from those paid to the gods (τιμαὶ ... ἥρωσιν ἀλλὰ, καὶ αὗται ἀποκεκριμέναι τοῦ θεοῦ). Diogenes Laertios (8.33) refers to Pythagoras, saying that equal worship should not be paid to gods and heroes (τιμὰς θεοῖς δεῖν νομίζειν καὶ ἥρωσι μὴ τὰς ἴσας). The actual distinctions do not concern the treatment of the animal victims, however, but are outlined as worshipping the gods with prayers, wearing white robes and observing purity, while the ceremonies to the heroes were to take

place only from midday onwards. Post-Classical sources often specify sacrifices as ὥς ἥρω or ὥς θεῶ, but the meaning here is rather the status of the recipient than the sacrificial rituals (see the discussion above, pp. 206–212). Similarly, Diodorus Siculus (1.2.4; 4.1.4) speaks of heroic or godlike honours and sacrifices being accorded to great and good men, while Plutarch (*De mul. vir.* 255d–e) mentions the case of Lampsake, who after death and burial was first given heroic honours (*heroikai timai*) but, at a later stage, they were replaced by sacrifices to her as to a goddess (ὑστερον ὥς θεῶ θύειν). According to Konon (*FGrHist* 26 F 1, 45.6), a *temenos* was built around the head of Orpheus, buried on the beach where it landed, which then became a *heroon* and later a *hieron*, where people perform sacrifices (*thysiai*) and celebrate rites by which the gods are honoured (*timontai*). Also, in these cases, there seems to be the question of the status of the recipient rather than the contents of the rituals.

89 One of the trends in the study of hero-cults has been to focus on a particular category of heroes, for example, athletes (Fontenrose 1968; Bohringer 1979); eponymous heroes (Kron 1976); former enemies transformed into heroes (Visser 1982); heroes from a certain region, such as Corinth (Broneer 1942) or Attica (Kearns 1989); heroines (Larson 1995). See also Nagy, 1979, on the separation of heroes of epic and heroes of cult, often referred to in modern studies. The idea of dividing heroes into categories can be traced back to Farnell’s work in 1921 and has been characterized as a result of the long-standing, scholarly concern to “introduce some order” among the heterogeneous group of heroes (see Bruit Zaidman & Schmitt Pantel 1995, 180). Cf. Coldstream 1976, 8: “Greek hero-worship has always been a rather untidy subject, where any general statement is apt to provoke suspicion”.

90 For the funerary laws, see Seaford 1994, 74–86; Toher 1991; cf. Parker 1996, 133–135. For grave monuments, see Morris 1992, 128–155.

91 On the heroic burials, see Antonaccio 1995a, 221–243; Antonaccio 1995b, 5–27.

92 This has been suggested in particular for the West Gate *heroon* at Eretria, see Antonaccio 1995a, 228–236; cf. de Polignac 1995, 128–138; Bérard 1982, 89–90; Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 352–357. However, at other sites where a cult would have been expected, for example at the so-called *heroon* at Toumba, Lefkandi, there are no signs of any memorial cult after the PG burials had been made, see Popham 1993, 98–99. Instead, a cemetery with rich graves was immediately located in the area to the east of the mound.

93 On the concept of the dead from Homeric to Classical times, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 15–107 and 298–302; Johnston 1999, *passim*, esp. 6–31.

94 Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 17–56; Johnston 1999, 11.

95 Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 17–18 and 298, who also argues that this was a thought that developed considerably in the post-Homeric times, providing models for hope of an afterlife also for common mortals and leading to the development of eschatologies promising a happy existence after death.

96 Burkert 1985, 204; Antonaccio 1995a, 245; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 90–94. Occasionally, the Bronze Age tombs have offerings from the 9th or even the 10th century, but the peak in this activity was clearly in the 8th century BC (see Antonaccio 1995a, 246). Moreover, there seems to be no mention of hero-cults in the Linear-B tablets (see Ventris & Chadwick 1973, 125–129 and 410–412), apart from *ti-re-se-ro-e*, which more likely refers to the Tritopatores than to heroes (Ventris & Chadwick 1973, 289; Hemberg 1954).

97 Antonaccio 1995a, *passim*, esp. 139–143; Mazarakis Ainian 1999, 9–36; Boehringer 2001, *passim*.

98 The Menidi tholos in Attica (Antonaccio 1995a, 104–109; Boehringer 2001, 48–54 and 94–102), the Berbati tholos in the Argolid (Ekroth 1996, 201–206 and 222–224; Wells, Ekroth & Holmgren 1996, 191–201) and some of the tholoi in Messenia (Antonaccio 1995a, 70–102; Boehringer 2001, 243–371) have yielded substantial amounts of material. Two recent studies of this material both arrive at the conclusion that the cult explanation has been greatly exaggerated, see Ratinaud-Lachkar 1999, 87–108; Shelton (forthcoming).

99 Antonaccio 1993, 48–49; Antonaccio 1995a, 245–268; for objections, see Parker 1996, 34–35, esp. n. 21; Ekroth 1997–98. One of Antonaccio's main arguments (246), the lack of inscribed dedications from the Bronze Age tomb contexts, is not conclusive, considering the number of heroes who were venerated without being named in later periods (for references, see Rohde 1925, 127 with n. 62; cf. van Straten 1995, 96). Cf. Henrichs 1991, 192–193, on the anonymity of heroes as a particular characteristic.

100 For references, see Antonaccio 1995a, 246; 147–152 (Agamemnoneion); 152–155 (Polis cave, Ithaka) and 155–166 (Menelaion); cf. Antonaccio 1993, 55; Antonaccio 1994, 403–404; Mazarakis Ainian 1999, 11–18. On Polis cave, see also Malkin 1998, 108–109. The interest in relics seems to have been an Archaic feature at the earliest and the number of recorded cases of relic-mongering are in fact few, see Antonaccio 1993, 62–63; Antonaccio 1995a, 265–266.

101 On the fact that many hero shrines did not have a tomb or were centred on a tomb, see Kearns 1992, 65–68; Bérard 1983, 45 and 53–54; de Polignac 1995, 141–143. See Sai'd (1998, 9–20) arguing for the growing importance of the tomb in hero-cults, especially as a focus for rituals, in the literary tradition from Homer to Apollonios Rhodios.

102 Cf. Johnston 1999, 154–155; McCauley 1999, 94–95.

103 Wide 1907; Rohde 1925, 158–162; Harrison J. 1922, 1–31; Gallet de Santerre 1958, 136 and 150. For a useful historical overview, in particular of the 19th and early 20th century scholars, see Schlesier 1991–92, 38–51.

104 For a critique of two direct cases of evolutionism, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 356–361, on the character and development of Charon; Sourvinou-Inwood 1991, 217–243, esp. 222, on the previous owners of Apollon's sanctuary at Delphi.

105 Malkin 1987, 189–266; cf. Antonaccio 1999, 109–121.

106 Malkin 1987, 261 and 263; cf. Antonaccio 1995a, 267–268; Bérard 1982, 94–95.

107 On the date in general, see Seaford 1994, 107; Stupperich 1994, 93; Parker 1996, 132–133; Jacoby 1944, 42–45; Sourvinou-Inwood 1994, 428. An early case of the honouring of the war dead, however, not containing any references to sacrifices, is a 6th-century epigram from Ambrakia, see Bousquet 1992, 596–605 (see also SEG 41, 1991, 540); cf. Fuqua 1981, on Tyrtaios reflecting the heroization of the Spartan war dead.

108 A hint of the prominence of dining hero-cults from early on may be seen in one of the earliest references to a hero being the hero Daïtes, “Feaster”, who was honoured among the Trojans, according to Mimnermos fr. 18 (West 1971–72, 88).

109 For the immortal nature of the war dead, see above, p. 262, nn. 232–233. For the need of a particular treatment of those killed in war, separate from that of the ordinary dead, and often emphasizing a distance between the war dead and death itself, see Tarlow 1997, 102–121, esp. 111–115, discussing the treatment and attitudes to those killed in the First World War.

110 On the funerary legislation, see Seaford 1994, 74–92; Parker 1996, 49–50; Stupperich 1977, *passim*; Sourvinou-Inwood 1983, 47–48; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 421 and 440; Toher 1991.

111 For example, the practice of depositing offerings in the Bronze Age tombs ceased in the Classical period, to be revived in post-Classical times, see Alcock 1991.

112 Cf. Antonaccio 1993, 62–65; Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 357; Antonaccio 1999, 120–121, suggesting that also the hero-cults in the colonies may, in fact, be later than is usually thought. Few hero shrines show any activity before the 7th century. This is a question that needs to be considered in connection with the archaeological material, since most hero sanctuaries identified by written sources have yielded archaeological evidence pre-dating the written evidence.

113 Mentions of gods and dedications to gods are found from the end of the 8th century BC and marked tombstones in the first half of the 7th century BC; see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 285; Powell B. 1989; Jefferey 1990, 61–62; Thomas 1992, 59. One of the earliest epigraphical references to sacrifices to heroes is a sacred law from the early 6th century BC from Sicily (Dubois 1989, 25–27, no. 20). The earliest inscribed dedication at the Menelaion may be no earlier than c. 600 BC, according to Jefferey 1990, 446 and 448, no. 3a (the aryballos itself dating from c. 650 BC). The excavators suggest a date around 675–650 BC, see Catling & Cavanagh 1976, 147–152. See also the early 6th century *heroon* at Argos for the heroes who participated in the expedition against Thebes; for references, see p. 59 with n. 159.

114 Parker 1996, 33–39.

115 For an overview of the now abundant literature on the relation between the rise of the polis and the occurrence of hero-cults, see Parker 1996, 36–39; Antonaccio 1995a, 6–9; de Polignac 1995, 127–149.

116 Sourvinou-Inwood 1983; Morris 1989; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 299–302; Johnston 1999, *passim*, esp. 95–100.

117 On aversion of the dead, see Johnston 1999, 36–123; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 434.

118 To mention two examples, altars do not occur on vase-paintings until Attic black-figure, but they then show an amazing variety, as a contrast to their more standardized appearance on red-figure vases (see Rupp 1991, 56–62; Cassimatis 1988). The votives also seem to become more specialized in the course of time: in the Geometric period, it is difficult to decide the recipient of a shrine from the votives, since the same objects were given to gods, heroes and the dead (see Hägg 1987; cf. Antonaccio 1995a, 247–248, underlining the regional distinctions).

Appendix. The sacrificial calendars of Attica

1. The sacrificial calendar from the deme Thorikos, c. 430 BC

1 After Daux 1983, 152–154; Daux 1984, 148–152; SEG 33, 1983, 147; see also p. 158, n. 134.

2 Lines 14 and 47: ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ, for suggested readings, see pp. 218–219.

3 Line 27: Νεανίαι, τέλεον, Πυανοψίοις, π[ρατόν] -, see Parker 1987, 146.

4 Line 36: Ἡρακλείδ[αις τέλεον], see Parker 1984, 59.

5 Line 56: for suggested restorations, see p. 158, n. 134.

6 1 [.....19..... Ἐκ]ατομβαιῶν-

7 [ος.....19.....]ΑΚΙ καὶ τοῖ-

8 [ς.....18..... ἄ]πριστομ παρέ-

9 [χεν.....14.....δρα]χμὴν ἑκατερ-

10 5 [ο.....19.....]ΑΙ τὴν πρηρο[σ]-

11

[ίαν.....14.....Δελ]φίνιον αἶγ[α]

[.....20.....]ΕΑΙ Ένάτηι [.]

[.....22.....]ΗΝΟΣΑ.ΤΗ[.]

[.....20?.....] τέλεομ πρατό[ν].

10 [Μεταγεινιῶνος, Διὶ Κατ]αιβάτηι ἐν τ-

ῶι σηγιῶι π[αρ] ἃ τὸ [Δελφί]νιον τέλεον πρ-

ατόν : ὀρικωμόσιον πα[ρέ]χεν ἐς εὐθύνας.

Βοηδρομιῶνος, Πρηρόσια : Διὶ Πολιεῖ κριτὸν οἶν : χοῖρον
κριτόν, ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ,

15 χοῖρον ὠνητὸν ὀλόκαυτον, τῶι ἀκόλου-

θῶντι ἄριστομ παρέχεν τὸν ἱερέα : Κεφ-

άλωι οἶν κριτὸν : Πρόκριδι τράπεζαν. vac.

Θορίκωι κριτὸν οἶν : Ἡρωῖνῃσι Θορίκο

τράπεζαν : ἐπὶ Σούνιον Ποσειδῶνι ἄμν-

20 ὄν κριτόν : Ἀπόλλωνι χίμαρον κριτόν, Κ-

οροτρόφωι χοῖρον κριτήν : Δήμητρι τέλ[εο]-

[ν], Διὶ Ἐριεῖω- τέλεον, Κοροτρόφωι χοῖρ[ον],

[Ἀθηναίαι οἶν πρατὸν] ἐφ' ἀλῆι : Ποσ[ειδῶνι]

τέλεον, Ἀπόλλωνι χοῖρον. vac.

25 Πυανοψιῶνος, Διὶ Καταιβάτηι ἐμ [Φιλομ]-

η<λ>ιδῶν τέλεον πρατόν, ἔκτῃ ἐ[πὶ δέκῃ]

31

Νεανίαι τέλεον, Πυανοψίοις, π[ρατόν]-

32

Μαιμακτηριῶνος, Θορίκῳ βοῦ [ν μῆλατ]-

33

τον ἢ τετταράκιοντα δραχμῶν [μέχρι πε]-

34

30 ντήκιοντα, Ἡρωῖνῃσι Θορίκιον τ[ράπεζαν].

35

Ποσιδειῶνος, Διονύσια, vac.

36

Γαμηλιῶνος, Ἡραι, Ἱερῷ Γάμῳ [..... 7]

37

Ἀνθεστηριῶνος, Διονύσῳ, δω[δεκάτῃ],

38

αἶγα λειπεγνώμονα πυρρὸν ἢ [μέλανα, Δ]-

39

35 ιασίοις, Διὶ Μιλιχίῳ οἶν πρα[τόν. vac.]

40

Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος, Ἡρακλείδ[αις τέλεον,]

41

Ἀλκιμήνης; τέλεον, Ἀνάκτοιν τ[έλεον, Ἐλέ]

42

νῇ τέλεον, Δήμητρι, τὴν χλο[ΐαν, οἶν κρ]-

43

ιτὴν κυῶσαν. Διὶ ἄρνα κριτόν. vac.

44

40 Μονυχιῶνος, Ἀρτέμιδι Μονυχ[ΐαι τέλε]-

45

{ε}ον, ἐς Πυθίον Ἀπόλλωνος τρίτ[τοαν, Κορ]-

46

οτρόφῳ χοῖρον, Λητοῖ αἶγα, Ἀ.[ρτέμιδι]

47

αἶγα, Ἀπόλλωνι αἶγα λειπογνώ[μονα, Δή]

48

μητρι : οἶν κυῶσαν ἄνθειαν, Φιλ[ωνίδι τρ]-

49

45 ἀπέζαν, Διονύσῳ, ἐπὶ Μυκηθον, [τράγον]

50

πυρρὸν ἢ μέλανα, vac.

51

θαργηλιῶνος, Διὶ ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ, [κριτὸν]

52

ἄρνα, Ὑπερπεδίωι οἶν, Ἡρωῖνῃσι[ν Ὑπερ]-

53

πεδίο τράπεζαν, Νίσωι οἶν, Θρασ[.. 5 ...]

54

50 οἶν, Σωσινέωι οἶν, Τογίωι οἶν, Πυ[λόχωι]

55

χοῖρον, Ἡρωῖνῃσι Πυλοχίσι τρά[πεζαν].

56

Σκιροφοριῶνος, ὀριωμόσιον <π>αρέ[χεν, Π.]-

57

λυντηρίοις Ἀθηναίαι οἶν κρι[τόν, Αὔλ]-

58

αύρωι οἶν, Ἀθηναίαι ἄρνα κριτ[όν, Κεφά]-

59

55 λωι βοῦν μῆλάττονος ἢ τεττα[ράκοντα]

60

δραχμῶν μέχρι πεντήκοντα, Π.[.....]

61

οἶδαν : τὸν δ' εὐθυνον ὁμόσαι καὶ τ[ὸς παρέδ]-

62

ρος εὐθυνῶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἣν ἔλαχ[ον εὐθύν]-

63

εν κατὰ τὰ ψηφίσματα ἐφ' οἷς ἐ[γναθέστ]-

64

60 ηῖεν ἡ ἀρχή, ὁμνύναι Δία, Ἀπόλλ[ω, Δήμητρ]-

65

α ἐξώλειαν ἐπαρώμενον, καὶ [τὸς παρέδ]-

66

ρος κατὰ ταῦτά, ἀναγράψαι [δὲ τὸν ὄρι]-

67

[ο]ν ἐστήλῃ καὶ καταθεῖναι π[αρὰ τὸ Δελ-φί]-

68

[ν]ιον, ὅσαι δ' ἂν ἀρχαὶ αἰρεθῶ- vac.

69

65 σιν ὑπεύθυνος εἶναι ἀπάσα[ς] vac.

70

Left side:

71

At the level of line 31 and the interspace between lines 31-32:

72

-ωνι τέλεον πυ-

73

ανοψίοις

74

At the level of line 42:

75

-ι Ἐρκεῖωι ; οἷν At the level of line 58:

76

-ωῖνησιν Κορωνέων : οἷν Right side:

77

At the level of lines 4-6:

78

Ι Μυκηνο[ν---]

79

[.]AN Οἷν [:]N[---]?

80

ΙΣΟ[---].

81

At the level of line 12:

82

Φοινίηι τέλ[εον]

83

At the level of line 44:

84

[Διὺ Ἐ]ρκεῖωι ; οἷν

2. The sacrificial calendar of the deme Marathon, c. 400–350 BC

85

After LS 20 B; see also p. 159, n. 137 and p. 160, n. 138.

86

87

.... ιο[.....τάδε ὁ δῆμαρχος]

88

[ὁ Μα]ραθωνίων θύει ἐ[ν.....

89

ηνται δέκα ἡμερῶν ἥρωι : [χοῖρος ὀοο, ἡρωῖνῃι]

90

χοῖρος ὀοο τράπεζα τῶι ἥρωι καὶ τῇι ἡρωῖνῃι].

91

5 Βοηδρομιῶνος· πρὸ μ [υ] στ [η] ρ [ίων.....

92

βδς ΡΔΔΔΔ, οἷς Δοο. Κουροτρόφωι.....

93

δευτέρας τριμήνου· Ποσιδεῶ[νος.....

94

βοῦς ΗΔΔΔΔ, οἷς Δοο, ἡρωῖνῃι [οἷς Δο, ιερῶσυνα]

95

Γοο. Γῆι ἐγ Γύαις βοῦς κύουσα ΡΔΔ[ΔΔ, ιερῶσυνα...]

96

10 Τελετῇι : σπυλια : ΔΔΔΔ vac.

97

τρίτης τριμήνου· Γαμηλ[ιῶ]νος·

98

Δαίραι οἷς κύουσα ΔΓο, ιερῶσυνα ο vac.

99

Γῆι ἐπὶ τῶι μαντείωι οἷς Δο. Διὶ ὑπ[άτωι...]

100

Ίόλεωι οἷς Δοο Κοροτρόφωι χοῖρο[ς ὀοο, τράπε]-

101

15 ζα h, ιερῶσυνα οοΙC. ἥρωι Φηραίωι [οἷς Δοο,]

102

ἡρωῖνῃι οἷς Δο, ιερῶσυναοοο- vac.

103

Ἐλα[φη]βολιῶνος δεκάτηι ἱσταμένο· [Γῆι ἐπὶ τῶι]

104

μαν[τε]ίωι τράγος παμμέλας ΔΓ. ιε[ρῶσυνα ο]

105

τετάρτης τριμήνου· Μουνιχιῶας Ἄρ[.

20...]νέχων βοῦς ΡΔΔΔΔ, οἷς Δ□□, ἡρωῖνῃ οἷς Δ□, ιεῖρώσυ]§

να Γ□□ Νεανίαι βῶς ΡΔΔΔΔ, οἷς Δ□□, χοῖρο[ς□□□]

ἡρωῖνῃ οἷς Δ□, ιερῶσυνα Γ□□ IC. vac

τάδε ὁ δήμαρχος ὁ Μαραθωνίων θύει ἥρωι ἐν

...]ρασιλείαι : οἷς Δ□□-, τράπεζα □ ἡρωῖνῃ οἷς Δ□.

25 ἥρωι παρὰ τὸ Ἑλλώτιον οἷς Δ□□ τράπεζα □, ἡρωί-

νῃ οἷς Δ□. vac.

Θαργηλιῶνος Ἀχαῖαι κριὸς Δ□□, θήλ[ε]α Δ□,

ιερῶσυνα □□□. Μοίραις χοῖρος -□□□ ιερῶ[σ]-

υνα IC. vac.

30 Σκίροφοριῶνος πρὸ Σκίρων Ὑπτηνίωι τὰ ὥρα[ι]-

α οἷς Δ□□. Κοροτρόφωι χοῖρος □□□, ιερῶσυνα □□ I.

Τριτοπατρεῦσι οἷς, ιερῶσυνα □□ Ἀνάμασιν

οἷς Δ□□-, ιερῶσυνα □□- vac.

τάδε τὸ ἕτερον ἔτος προτέρα δραμοσύνη Ἐκα[τ]-

35 ομβαιῶνος Ἀθηναῖαι Ἑλλωτίδι βῶς ΓΔΔΔΔ,

οἷς τρεῖς ΔΔΔ□□□, χοῖρος □□□ ιερῶσυνα ΓΗ...

Κοροτρόφωι οἷς Δ□, χοῖρος □□□ ιερῶσυνα □ ..

δαφνηφόροις Γ□□- vac.

τάδε τὸ ἔτερον ἔτος θύεται μετὰ Εὐβουλον ἄρχ[ο]-

126

40 ντα Τερταπολεῦσι· ὑστέρα δραμοσύνη

127

Ἐιατομβαιῶνος· Ἀθηναῖαι Ἑλλωτίδι οἷς Δ [□],

128

Κοροτρόφωι χοῖρος □□□ ιερῶσυνα □□.

129

Μεταγειντιῶνος· Ἐλευσινίαι βῶς ΓΔΔΔ[Δ],

130

Κόρηι κριὸς ΔΙ-Ι-, χοίροι τρεῖς Γ□□□□ ιερῶ[σ]-

131

45 υνα Γ□□□□□, ἀλφίτων ἐντεὺς □□□, οἶνο χῶ [ς..],

132

Κοροτρόφωι οἷς Δ□-, ιερῶσυνα □

133

Διὶ Ἀνθαλεῖ οἷς ΔΙ-Κ ιερῶσυνα □□

134

Ἀνθεστηριῶνος· Ἐλευσινίαι ὕς κύουσα : ΔΔ,

135

ιερῶσυνα □|. Χλόηι παρὰ τὰ Μειδύλου ὕς κίου[σα]

136

50 ΔΔ, ιερῶσυνα □ ἀλφίτων ἐντεὺς □□□, οἶνο χ[ῶς..].

137

Σκιροφοριῶνος· πρὸ Σκίρων Γαλίωι κριὸς Δ[□□],

138

ιερῶσυνα □□ (ρρέατος Γ□ Τριτοπατρεῦσι

139

τράπεζα □

3. The sacrificial calendar of the deme Erchia, c. 375–350 BC

140

After Daux 1963a, 606–610; *LS* 18; *SEG* 21, 1965, 541; see also p. 161, n. 139.

141

For the three cases of *ou phora* added later, see Daux 1963a, 628.

142 [Θ] ε ο ί
143 Δημαχία ή μέζων
144 Col. I
145 Μεταγεινιῶ-
146 νος δωδεκάτε-
147 ι, Ἀπόλλωνι ν Λ-
148 υκείωι, ἐν ἄστ-
149 5 ει, οἷς, οὐ φο, Δ
150 δεκάτει, προτ-
151 έραι, Ἥραι Θελ-
152 χινίαι, ἐμ Πάγ-
153 ωτΈρχι, ἄρνα π-
154 10 αμμέλαιναν, ο-
155 ὑ φορά Γ ν
156 Βοηδρομιῶνος
157 τετράδι φθίν-
158 οντος, Νύμφαι-
159 15 ς, ἐμ ΠάγωιΈρχ-
160 ιᾱ, οἷς, Δ ν
161

Πυανοψιῶνος τ-

162

ετράδι ἐπὶ δὲ -

163

κα, Ἡρωῖναις, ἐ-

164

20 μ Πυλῶνι Ἐρχι,

165

οῖς, οὐ φορά, ἰε-

166

ρεῖαι τὸ δέρ, Δ

167

Γαμηλιῶνος ἐβ-

168

δόμηι ἰσταμέ-

169

25 νο, Κουροτρόφ-

170

ωι, ἐν Δελφινί-

171

ωι Ἐρχ : χοῖρ, □□□

172

Ἀπόλλωνι Δελ-

173

φινίωι, Ἐρχιᾶ,

174

30 οῖς, Δ□□ ν

175

ὀγδόηι ἰσταμ-

176

ένου, Ἀπόλλων-

177

ι Ἀποτροπαίω-

178

ι, Ἐρχιᾶσι, πρὸ-

179

35 [ς] Παιανιέων, ν

180

αἶξ, Δ□□ ν

181 Ἀνθεστηριῶνο-
182 ς, Διασίοις, ἐν
183 ἄστε (ι) ἐν Ἄγρας,
184 40 Διὶ Μιλιχίωι,
185 οἷς, νηφάλιος
186 μέχρι σπλάγχ-
187 [ν]ων, Δ[] ν
188 [Ε] λαφηβολιῶνο-
189 45 ς ἔκτῃ ἐπι δὲ -
190 κα, Σεμέλῃι, ἐπ-
191 ἰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βω-
192 μοῦ, αἶξ, γυναι-
193 ξ ἰ παραδόσιμ-
194 50 ος, ἱερέας τὸ δ-
195 ἔρμα, οὐ φορά, Δ
196 [Θ]αργηλιῶνος τ-
197 ετράδι ἰσταμ-
198 ἐνο, Λητοῖ, ἐμ Π-
199 55 [ν]θίο Ἐρχιᾶσι,

[α] ἴξ : Δ ν

201

[Σ] κίροφοριῶνο-

202

ς τρίτη (ι) ἰσταμ-

203

ένου Κοροτρ-

204

60 ὀφωι, ἐμ Πόλει

205

Ἐρχ : χοῖρος, □□□

206

Ἀθηνάαι Πολι-

207

άδι, ἐμ Πόλει Ἐ-

208

ρχιᾶσι, οἷς ἄν-

209

65 [τ]ίβους, Δ ν

210

[Κε]φάλαιον ν

211

Col. II

212

Μεχαγεινιῶ-

213

νος δω[δεκ]άτ-

214

ει, ἐν Ἐλευσι(νίωι)

215

ἐν ᾄστει, Δήμ-

216

5 ητρι, οἷς, Δ ν

217

ἔκχηι, ἐπὶ δέ-

218

κα, Κοροτρόφ-

219

ωι, ἐν [Ε] κήχης

220

Ἐρχιᾶσι, χοῖ-

221

10 ρος, □□□ ν

222

Ἀρτέμιδι Ἐκ

223

άχει, Ἐρχιᾶ[σ]-

224

ι[ν, αῖ]ξ, Δ ν

225

Βο[ηδ]ρομιῶνο-

226

15 ς τετράδι ις-

227

ταμένο, Βασί-

228

λει, Ἐρχιᾶ, ἀμ-

229

νὴ λευκή, ὀλό-

230

καυχος, νηφά-

231

20 λιος, Γ□□ ν

232

τετράδι φθί-

233

νοντος, ἐμ Πά-

234

[γ]ωι Ἐρχιᾶσι-

235

ν, Ἀχελώωι ν

236

25 οῖς Δ□□ ν

237

Γαμηλιῶνος

238

ἐνάχῃι ἰστα-

239

μένο, Ἡροσου-
 240
 ρίοις, ἐμ Πόλ-
 241
 30 εἰ Ἐρχιᾶσι, Ἄ-
 242
 θήνᾳ, ἀμνή Γ
 243
 τετράδι φθι-
 244
 νοντος, Κουρ-
 245
 οτρόφωι, ἐν Ἡ-
 246
 35 ρας Ἐρχιᾶσι,
 247
 χοῖρος, ν
 248
 Ἡραι, Ἐρχιᾶσ-
 249
 ι, οἷς, ἱερέαι
 250
 δέρμα, Δ ν
 251
 40 Μουνιχιῶνο-
 252
 ς τετράδι ἰσ-
 253
 ταμένου, Ἡρα-
 254
 κλείδαις, οἷς,
 255
 Ἐρχιᾶ, Δ ν
 256
 (added later) οὐ φ(ορά)
 257
 45 [Θ]αργηλιῶνος
 258
 τετράδι ἰστ-

259 αμένο, Ἀπόλλ-
260 ωνι Πυθίωι, Ἐ-
261 ρχι : αἶξ, παρα-
262 50 δόσιμος Πυθ-
263 αῖσχαῖς, Δ

264 Ἀπόλλωνι Πα-
265 ιῶνι, ἐμ Πάγω-
266 ι Ἐρχι, οἷς, Δ

267 55 [Σ] κίροφοριῶν-
268 ος τρίτηι ἰσ-

269 ταμένο, Ἀγλα-

270 ύρωι, ἐμ Πόλε (ι)

271 Ἐρχι : οἷς, Δ ν

272 (added later) οὐ φο(ρά)

273 60 Κεφάλαιον ν

274 Η Γ

275 vacat

276 Col. III

277 [Ε] κατομβαιῶν-

278

ος δεκάτει ὕ-
279 στέραι, Κουρ-
280 οτρόφωι, ἐς Σ-
281 5 ωτιδῶν Ἐρχι,
282 χοῖρος, οὐ φο-
283 ρά, [] υ
284 Ἀρτέμιδι ἐς
285 Σωτιδῶν Ἐρχ-
286 10 ι : αἶξ, οὐ φορά,
287 τὸ δέρμα κατ-
288 αγίζ : Δ υ
289 [Μ]εταγειτνιῶ-
290 νος δωδεκάτ-
291 15 ει, Διὶ Πολιε(ῖ),
292 ἐμ Πόλε (ι) ἐν ἄσ-
293 τε (ι) οἷς, οὐ φορ-
294 ά, Δ[] υ
295 ἔκτηι φθίνο-
296 20 ντος, Διὶ Ἐπω-
297 πετεῖ, ἐμ Πάγ-

298 ωι Ἐρχιᾶσι, χ-
299 οἶρος, ὀλόκα-
300 υτος, νηφάλι-
301 25 ος, □□□ υ
302 [B]οηδρομιῶνο-
303 ς τετράδι θφ-
304 ίνοντος, Ἀλό-
305 χωι, ἐμ Πάγωι
306 30 Ἐρχι : οἶς : Δ υ
307 [Γ]αμηλιῶνος ὁ-
308 γδόηι ἰσταμ-
309 έ, Ἀ πόλλωνι Ἀ -
310 ποτροπαίωι,
311 35 Ἐρχιᾶσι, αἶξ,
312 Π.υ[θα]ῖισχαῖς
313 παραδόσ, Δ□□
314 τετράδι φθί-
315 νοντος, Διὶ Τ-
316 40 ελείωι, ἐν Ἥρ-
317

ας Ἐρχι : οἷς, Δ

318

[Α]νθεστηριῶν-ος δευτέραι

319

ἱσταμένο, Δι-

320

45 ονύσῳι, Ἐρχι,

321

ἔριφος προπ-

322

τόρθι : Γ ν

323

[Μ]ονιχιῶνος δ-

324

εκάτει [πρ]οτ-

325

50 ἔραι, Λευκάσ-

326

πιδι, Ἐρχιᾶ, ο-

327

ῖς, νηφάλιος,

328

οὐ φορά, Δ

329

[Θ]αργηλιῶνος

330

55 τετράδι ἱστ-

331

αμένο, Δι, ἐμ

332

πάγῳι, Ἐρχιᾶ,

333

οἷς, Δ ν

334

[Σ] κίροφοριῶν-

335

60 ος τρίτει ἱσ-

336

τάμενο, Δι Π-

337 ολιε (ĩ), ἐμ Πόλε (ι)

338 Ἐρχιᾷσι, οἷς,

339 οὐ φορά, Δ

340 65 ἔκτ[ηι ἐ]πὶ δέ-

341 κα

342 Col. IV

343 Ἐιατομβαιῶν –

344 ος δεκάτει ὑ-

345 στέραι, Κορο-

346 [τρ]όφωι, ἐπὶ τ-

347 5 [ὄ] Ἄκρο Ἐρχιᾷ,

348 χοῖρος, οὐ φο-

349 ρά, v

350 Ἀρτέμιδι, ἐπ-

351 ἰ τῷ Ἄκρο Ἐρχ-

352 10 ιᾷ, αἶξ, οὐ φορ-

353 ά, δέρμα κατα-

354 ιγίζε : Δ v

355 Μεταγειτνιῶ-

356

νος δωδεκάτ-

357

15 ε (ι), Ἀθηνᾶι Πολ-

358

ιάδι, ἐμ Πόλε (ι)

359

ἐν ἄστε (ι), οἷς : Δ

360

Βοηδρομιῶνο-

361

ς πέμπτει ἴσ-

362

20 ταμέ : Ἑποπι, Ἑ-

363

ρχιᾶσι, χοῖρ-

364

ος, ὀλόκαυτο-

365

ς, νηφάλι : □□□

366

τετράδι φθί-

367

25 νοντος, Ἑρμῆ-

368

ι, ἐμ Πάγῳι Ἑρ-

369

χιᾶ : οἷς : Δ□□ ν

370

Γαμηλιῶνος τ-

371

ετράδι φθίν-

372

30 οντος, Ποσει-

373

δῶνι, ἐν Ἥρας

374

Ἑρχιᾶ, οἷς, Δ□□

375

Ἐλαφηβολιῶν-

376

ος ἔκτετι ἐπὶ

377

35 δέκα, Διονύσ-

378

ωι, Ἐρχιᾶ, αἶξ

379

παραδό : γυνα-

380

{α}ιξί, οὐ φορά,

381

ιερéαι τὸ δέ-

382

40 ρμα, Δ□□ ν

383

Μονιχιῶνος δ-

384

εκάτει ὑστέ-

385

ραι, Τριτοπα-

386

τρεῦσι, Ἐρχι,

387

45 οἷς, νηφάλιο-

388

ς, οὐ φορά : Δ□□

389

Θαργηλιῶνος

390

τετράδι ιστ-

391

αμένο, Ἀνάκο-

392

50 ιν Ἐρχιᾶσιν,

393

οἷς, Δ□□ ν

394

ἐνάτει ἐπὶ δ-

395

έκα, Μενεδεί-

396

ωι, Ἐρχιᾶσιν,

397

55 οἷς, οὐ φορ, Δ

398

Σκιροφοριῶν-

399

ος τρίτηι ἰσ-

400

ταμένο, Ποσε-

401

ιδῶνι, ἐμ Πόλ-

402

60 ε (ι) Ἐρχι : οἷς : Δ

403

Κεφάλαιον

404

ΗΔ

405

Col. V

406

Μεταγειτνι-

407

ῶνος ἐνάτε (ι)

408

ἐπὶ δέκα, Ἡρ-

409

ωῖναις, ἐπὶ

410

5 Σχοίνωι Ἐρ-

411

χιᾶσι, οἷς, οὐ φορά, ἱερέ-

412

αι τὸ δέρ : Δ ν

413

Βοηδρομιῶν-

414

10 ος πέμπτῃ

415 ἵσταμένο, Ἐ-
416 ρχι : Ἔποπι, χ-
417 οἶρος, ὀλόκ-
418 αυτος, νηφά-
419 15 λιος, ὀλλ ν
420 τετράδι φθ-
421 ἴνοντος Γῆ-
422 ι, ἐμ Πάγωι Ἐ-
423 ρχιᾶσι, οἷς
424 20 κύουσα, οὐ φ-
425 ορά, Δ ν
426 Ποσιδεῶνος
427 ἔκτηι ἐπὶ δ-
428 ἐκα, Δί, ἐμ Π-
429 25 ἔτρηι Ἐρχι-
430 ᾶσιν, οἷς, οὐ
431 φορά, Δλλ ν
432 Δι Ὀρίωι, Ἐ-
433 ρχιᾶσι, χοῖ-
434

30 ρος, οὐ φο : ρρρ

435

Γαμηλιῶνος

436

ἐβδόμηι ἰσ-

437

ταμένο, Ἀπό-

438

λλωνι Λυκε-

439

35 ἰωι, Ἐρχιᾶσ-

440

ι, οἷς, Πυθαῖ-

441

σταῖς παρ[α]-

442

δόσιμος, Δρρ

443

(added later) οὐ φο(ρά)

444

ὀγδόη (ι) ἰστα-

445

40 μένο, Ἀπόλλ-

446

ωνι Νυμφη[γ]-

447

έτει, Ἐρχιᾶ-

448

σιν, αἷξ, Δρρ

449

Νύμφαις, ἐπ-

450

45 ἰ τῶ αὐτοῦ β-

451

ωμοῦ, αἷξ : Δ υ

452

θαργηλιῶνο-

453

ς τετράδι ἰ-

454 σταμένο, Ἐρ-
 455 50 μῆι, ἐν ἀγορ-
 456 ᾧ Ἐρχιδᾷσι,
 457 κριός, τούτ-
 458 ωι ἰερεῶσθ-
 459 αι τὸν κήρυ-
 460 55 κα καὶ τὰ γέ-
 461 ρα λαμβάνε-
 462 ν καθά<π>ερ ὁ
 463 δήμαρχος, Δ
 464 ἔκτῃ ἐπὶ δ-
 465 60 ἑκα, Διί Ἐπ[α]-
 466 κρίωι, ἐν Ὑμ-
 467 ηττωι, ἀρ[ήν],
 468 νηφάλι[ος, ο]-
 469 ὑφορά, [Γῶ ν]
 470 65 Σκιροφ [οριῶ]-
 471 νος.---

4. The sacrificial calendar of the *genos*

of the Salaminioi, 363/2 BC

472

After LSS 19; Ferguson 1938, 3–5; see also Lambert S. 1997, 86–88; see also p. 163, n. 147. Line 92: ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ τᾶλλα □□□□, see Lambert S. 1997, 93.

473

θεοί

474

Ἐπὶ Χαριλείδν ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοις· ἐπὶ τοῖς[δ]-

475

ε διήλλαξαν οἱ διαιτηταὶ Σαλαμινίος τὸς ἐν τῷ-

476

ν Ἐπταφυλῶν καὶ Σαλαμινίος τοὺς ἀπὸ Σονίο ὁμο-

477

5 λογοῦντας ἀλλήλοις καλῶς ἔχειν ἃ ἔγνωσαν οἱ δι-

478

αιτηταὶ Στέφανος Μυρρινόσιος, Κλεαγόρας Ἀχα-

479

ρνεύς, Ἀριστογεΐτων Μυρρινόσιος, Εὐθύκριτος

480

Λαμπρεύς, Κηφισόδοτος Αἰθαλίδης τὰς ἱερεωσ-

481

ύνας κοινὰς εἶναι ἀμφοτέρων εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόν-

482

10 ον τῆς Ἀθηνάας τῆς Σκιράδος, καὶ τὴν τδ Ἡρακλέο-υ τδ ἐπὶ Πορθμῷ, καὶ τὴν τδ Εὐρυσάκιος, καὶ τὴν τῆς Ἀγλαύρο καὶ Πανδρόσο καὶ τῆς Κορότφο καὶ κ-

483

ληρῶσθαι κοινῇ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἐπειδὰν τελευτ-

484

ήσει τις τῶν ἱερειῶν ἢ τῶν ἱερέων τὸς δὲ λανχάν-

485

15 οντας ἱερεῶσθαι ἐφ' οἷσπερ καὶ οἱ πρότερον ἱερ-

486

εῶντο· τὴν δὲ γῆν τὴν ἐφ' Ἡρακλείωι τῷ ἐπὶ Πορθμ-

487

ῶι καὶ τὴν ἀλ{λ}ήν καὶ τὴν ἀγορὰ τὴν ἐν Κοίλῃι νε-

488

ίμασθαι διχαστήν ἑκατέρος, καὶ ὅρος στῆσαι τῆς ἑαυτῶν
ἑκατέρος· θύεν δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἡ-

489

20 ρωσι κατὰ τάδε· ὅσα μὲν ἡ πόλις παρέχει ἐκ τοῦ δημ-

490

οσιο ἢ παρὰ τῶν ὠ [σ] κοφόρων ἢ παρὰ τῶν δειπνοφόρ-

491

ων γίγνεται λαμβάνειν Σαλαμινίοις, ταῦτα μὲν

492

κοινῇ ἀμφοτέρος θύοντας νέμεσθαι τὰ κρέα ὦμ-

493

ὰ τὰ ἡμίσεα ἑκατέρος ὅσα δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς μισθώσεως ἔ-

494

25 θυον Σαλαμῖνιοι παρὰ σφῶν αὐτῶν θύειν κατὰ τὰ

495

πάτρια, τὸ ἥμισυ ἑκατέρος συμβαλλομένος εἰς ἅπαντα τὰ ἱερά·
τοῖς δὲ ἱερεῦσι καὶ ταῖς ἱερεῖαι-

496

ς ἀποδιδόναι τὰ γέρα τὰ γεγραμμένα· τῷ δὲ τῷ Ἡρ-

497

ακλέος ἱερεῖ ἱερεώσυνα ΔΔΔ δραχμὰς εἰς πελαν-

498

30 ὄν δὲ □□□ δραχμὰς τούτων τὸ ἥμισυ ἑκατέρος συμ-

499

βάλλεσθαι· τῶν δὲ ἱερειῶν ὧν ἂν κατάρχῃται τῶν

500

κοινῶν λαμβάνειν δαρτὸ δέρμα καὶ τὸ σιέλος, εὐ-

501

στὸ τὸ σιέλος βοδὸς δὲ ἐννέα σάρκας καὶ τὸ δέρμα

502

τῷ δὲ τῷ Εὐρυσάκῳ ἱερεῖ ἱερεώσυνα Γ□ δραχμὰ-

503

35 ς εἰς πελανὸν ἀμφοτέρωσε Γ□□ δραχμὰς· σιέλος καὶ

504

δέρματος ἐν Εὐρυσακείῳ Δ□□□ δραχμὰς τούτ-

505

ων τὸ ἥμισυ ἑκατέρος συμβάλλεσθαι τῷ ἥρῳ τῷ

506

ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλῇ τῶν θυομένων λαμβάνειν τὸ δέρμα

καὶ τὸ σιέλος νέμειν δὲ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ ταῖς ἱ-

40 ερείαις ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὅπο ἂν ἔκαστοι ἱερῶντ-

αι μερίδα παρ' ἐκατέρων τὸς ἄρτος ἐς Σκιράδος ν-

έμειν κατὰ τὰδε, ἀφελόντας ἐξ ἀπάντων τὸς νομι-

ζομένος ἀφαιρεῖσθαι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια· κήρυκι ἄρ-

τον, Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερεῖαι ἄρτον, Ἡρακλέος ἱερεῖ ἄρτο-

45 ν, Πανδρόσο καὶ Ἀγλαύρο ἱερεῖαι ἄρτον, Κοροτρό-

φο καὶ καλαθηφόρῳ ἄρτον, κώπαις ἄρτον τῶν δὲ ἄ-

λλων νέμεσθαι τὰ ἡμίσεα ἐκατέρως ἄρχοντα δὲ κ-

ληρὸν ἐμ μέρος παρ' ἐκατέρων ὅστις καταστήσει τὸς
ὠσιοφόρος καὶ τὰς δειπνοφόρος μετὰ τῆς ἱε-

50 ρείας καὶ τὸ κήρυκος κατὰ τὰ πάτρια· ταῦτα δὲ ἀν-αγράψαι
ἐς στήλην κοινήν ἀμ(ροτέρος καὶ στήσα-

ι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Σκιράδος τὸν δὲ αὐ-

τὸν ἱερέα εἶναι τῷ Εὐρυσάκει καὶ τῷ ἥρῳ τῷ

ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλῆι· ἐὰν δὲ τι δέη ἐπισκευεάσαι τῶν ἱε-

55 ρῶν, ἐπισκευάζεν κοινῇ συμβαλλόμενος τὸ ἥμ-

υσυ ἐκατέρως ἐπὶ Χαρικλείδῳ ἄρχοντος οἱ ἐν τῶν

Ἑπταφυλῶν παρέσχον ἄρχοντα· τὰ δὲ γραμματεῖ-

α κοινὰ εἶναι ἀ[μφ]οτέρων ἅπαντα· τὴν δὲ γῆν ἐργά-

ζεσθαι τομ μεμι[σ]θωμένον ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃ ὁ χρόν-

526

60 ὃς δν ἐμισθώσατο, ἀποδιδόντα τὴν ἡμίσειαν μίσ-

527

θωσιν ἐνατέροις· τὸ δὲ πρόθυμα τὸ ἀμίλλο ἐμ μέρ-

528

ει ἐνατέρος κατάρχεσθαι τῶν δὲ κρεῶν τὰ ἡμίσε-

529

α ἐνατέρος λαμβάνειν καὶ τῶν δερμάτων τὴν δὲ ἰ-

530

ερεωσύνην τὸ κήρυκος εἶναι θρασυκλέος κατὰ τ-

531

65 ἂ πάτρια τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἐνκλημάτων ἀπάντων ἀφε-

532

ῖσθαι τῶν τε ἰδίων καὶ τῶν κοινῶν εἰς τὸν ν Βοηδ-

533

ρομιῶνα μῆνα τὸν ἐπὶ Χარიκλίδο ἄρχοντος, νν *vacat*

534

Ἐπὶ Διρίλο Διοπείθους Σουνιέως Σαλαμινίοις ἄρχ-

535

οντος, οἶδε ὤμοσαν Σαλαμινίων τῶν ἀπὸ Σουνίο Διο-

536

70 πείθης Φασυρκίδου, Φιλόνεως Ἀμεινονίου, Χαλιδ-

537

εὺς Ἀνδρομένους, Χαριάδης ΧαριἈλέος, θενφάνες

538

Ζωφάνους, Ἠγίας Ἠγησίο, Ἀμεινίας Φιλίνο. Ἐπὶ Ἀ ν-

539

τισθένους Ἀντιγένους Ἀρχανέως ἄρχοντος Σαλαμι-

540

νίοις, οἶδε ὤμοσαν ἐν τῶν Ἑπαφυλῶν Θρασυκλῆς Θρά-

541

75 σωνος Βουτά, Στρατοφῶν Στράτονος Ἄγρυ, Μελίττιος

542

Ἐξηγεστίδου Βουτά, Αρίσταρχος Δημοικλέους Ἀχαρ, ν

543

Ἀριέων Εὐμηλίδου Ἀχαρ, Χαιρέστρατος Πανικλίδου Ἐ-

544

πικηφί, Δήμων Δημαρέτο Ἀγρυλῆ. *Vacat*

545

Ἀρχέλεως εἶπεν ὅπως Σαλαμίνιοι τὰ ἱερὰ θύωσι αἰεὶ τοῖς θεοῖς
καὶ

546

τοῖς ἥρωσι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ

547

80 γίγνητα[ι] ἐφ' οἷς διήλλαξαν οἱ διαλλακταὶ ἀμφοτέρους καὶ
οἱ αἶρε-

548

θέντες ὤμοσαν, ἐψηφίεσθαι Σαλαμινί-

549

οις τὸν ἄρχοντα Ἀρίσταρχον ἐγγράψαι τὰς θυσίας ἀπάσας καὶ
τὰς

550

τιμὰς τῶν ἱερέων εἰς τὴν στήλην ἐν εἴ

551

αὶ διαλλαγαί εἰσιν, ὅπως ἂν οἱ ἄρχοντες αἰεὶ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων
εἰδῶσι

552

ὃ τι δεῖ ἀργύριον συνβάλλεσθαι εἰς τὰ [ς]

553

θυσίας ἀπάσας ἐνατέρους ἀπὸ τῆς μισθώσεως τῆς γῆς τῆς ἐφ'
Ἡρα-

554

κλείωι, καὶ στῆσαι τὴν στήλην ἐν τῷ

555

Εὐρυσακείωι. Μουνιχιῶνος. ἐπὶ Πορθμῶν Κουροτρόφωι αἶγα
Δ,

556

Ἰόλεωι οἷν ὀλόκαιτον ΔΓ : Ἀλκμήνει οἷν

557

85 Δ□□, Μαίαι οἷν Δ□□, Ἡρακλεῖ βοῦν ΓΔΔ, ἥρωι ἐπὶ τεῖ ἀλεῖ οἷν
ΔΓ,

558

ἥρωι ἐπ' Ἀντισάραι χοῖρον □□□|||, ἥρωι Ἐπι-

559

πυργιδίωι χοῖρον □□□|||, Ἴων(ι) οἷν θύειν ἐναλλάξ παρ' ἔτος·

560

ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ οἷς ἡ πόλις δίδωσιν ἐκ κύρβεω[ν]

561

Δ ὀγδόει ἐπὶ δέκα Εὐρυσάκι [ει] : ὕν : ΔΔΔΔ ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖ(ς) καὶ εἰς

562

τάλλα ἄῤῥῥῥ Ἑκατομβαιῶνος. Παναθηναίοις Ἀθηνᾶι

563

ὕν : ΔΔΔΔ : ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς κ[αὶ εἰ]ς τάλλα ἄῤῥῥῥ. Μεταγειτνιῶνος.

564

ἐβδόμει Ἀπόλλωνι Πατρώϊω ὕν : ΔΔΔΔ, Λητοῖ χοῖρο [ν]

565

[ῥ]ἄῤῥῥῥῥ, Ἀρτέμιδι χοῖρον ἄῤῥῥῥῥῥ, Ἀθηνᾶι Ἀγελάαι χοῖρον ἄῤῥῥῥῥ

566

ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ εἰς τάλλα ἄῤῥῥῥῥῥ. Βοηδρομιῶνος. Ποσει-

567

90 δῶνι Ἱπποδρομίῳ ὕν : ΔΔΔΔ, ἥρῳι Φαίαιι χοῖρον ἄῤῥῥῥῥῥ, ἥρῳι Τεύ-

568

κρῳι χοῖρον ἄῤῥῥῥῥῥ, ἥρῳι Ναυσείρῳι χοῖρον ἄῤῥῥῥῥῥ

569

ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ τάλλα ἄῤῥῥῥῥῥ. Πυανοψιῶνος. ἔκτει Θησεῖ ὕν ΔΔΔΔ

570

εἰς τάλλα ἄῤῥῥῥ- Ἀπατουρίοις Διὶ Φρατρίῳ ὕν ΔΔΔΔ

571

ξύλα ἐφ' ἱεροῖς καὶ τάλλα ἄῤῥῥῥῥῥ-. Μαιμακτηριῶνος. Ἀθηνᾶι Σκιράδι οἶν

572

ἐνκύμονα Δῶ, Σκίρῳι οἶν ΔΓ ξύλα ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἄῤῥῥῥ

573

κεφάλαιον οὗ δεῖ ἀναλίσκειν ἀφροτέρως ἐς ἅπαντα τὰ ἱερὰ ΓΔΔΔῥῥῥῥ.

574

ταῦτα θύειν κοινεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς μισθώσεως τῆς γῆς τῇ (ς) ἐφ' Ἡρακλ[εΐῳ]

575

[ἐπ] ἰ Σονίο, ἀργύριον συμβαλλομένους ἐκατέρους ἐς ἅπαντα τὰ ἱερὰ

576

ἐὰν δέ τις εἴπει ἢ ἄρχων ἐπιψηφίσει τούτων τι καταλ[ύ]

577

95 [σ]αι ἢ τρέψει ποι ἄλλοσε τὸ ἀργύριον, ὑπεύθυνον εἶναι τῷ
γένει

578

ἅπαντι καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι κατὰ ταῦτα καὶ ὑπό-

579

δικον καὶ τῷ βουλομένῳ Σαλαμινίων. vacat

Bibliography

Abbreviations used in the bibliography follow *AJA* 104, 2000, 10–14. Abbreviations of collections of inscriptions follow *Guide de l'épigraphiste. Bibliographie choisie des épigraphies antiques et médiévales*² (Bibliothèque de l'École normale supérieure. Guide et inventaires bibliographiques, 2), eds. F. Bérard et al., Paris 1989, 16–17.

Abramson 1978 H. Abramson, *Greek hero-shrines*. PhD diss. University of California, Berkeley 1978.

Adler 1928–35 *Suidae lexicon*, vols. 1–4 (Lexicographi graeci, 1:1–4), ed. A. Adler. Leipzig 1928–35.

Aikaterinides 1979 Γ.Ν. Αἰκατερινίδης, Νεοελληνικὲς αἵματηρὲς. Θυσίαις Λειτουργία-μορφο-λογία-τυπολογία (Λαογραφία. Δελτίον τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Λαογραφικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Παραρτήμα, 8). Athens 1979.

Aktseli 1996 D. Aktseli, *Altäre in der archaischen und klassischen Kunst. Untersuchungen zu Typologie und Ikonographie* (Internationale Archäologie, 28). Espelkamp 1996.

Alcock 1991 S.E. Alcock, 'Tomb cult and the post-Classical polis', *AJA* 95, 1991, 447–467.

Alcock 1993 S.E. Alcock, *Graecia capta. The landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge 1993.

Aleshire 1989 S.B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepiaion. The people, their dedications, and the inventories*. Amsterdam 1989.

Alexiou 1974 M. Alexiou, *The ritual lament in Greek tradition*. Cambridge 1974.

Allen 1912 *Homeri opera*, vol. 5, ed. T.W. Allen. Oxford 1912.

Amyx 1958 D.A. Amyx, 'The Attic stelai, part III', *Hesperia* 27, 1958,

Ancient Greek hero cult *Ancient Greek hero cult. Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on ancient Greek cult, organized by the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, Göteborg University, 21–23 April 1995* (ActaAth-80, 16), ed. R. Hägg. Stockholm 1999.

Anderson 1993 G. Anderson, *The second sophistic: a cultural phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London & New York 1993.

Antonaccio 1993 C.M. Antonaccio, 'The archaeology of ancestors', in *Cultural poetics*, 46–70.

Antonaccio 1994 C.M. Antonaccio, 'Contesting the past: hero cult, tomb cult, and epic in early Greece', *AJA* 98, 1994, 389–410.

Antonaccio 1995a C.M. Antonaccio, *An archaeology of ancestors: tomb cult and hero cult in Early Greece* (Greek studies: interdisciplinary approaches). Lanham 1995.

Antonaccio 1995b C.M. Antonaccio, 'Lefkandi and Homer', in *Homer's world. Fiction, tradition, reality* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 3), eds. Ø. Andersen & M. Dickie, Bergen 1995, 5–27.

Antonaccio 1999 C.M. Antonaccio, 'Colonization and the origins of hero cult', in *Ancient Greek hero cult*, 109–121.

Arafat 1992 K.W. Arafat, 'Pausanias' attitude to antiquities', *BSA* 87, 1992, 387–409.

Austin 1967 C. Austin, 'De nouveaux fragments de l'Érechthée d'Euripide', *Recherches de papyrologie* 4, 1967, 11–67.

Austin 1968 *Nova fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta* (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 187), ed. C. Austin. Berlin 1968.

Ayala 1989 G. Ayala, 'L'autel sur les monnaies antiques', *Archeologia* 251, 1989, 56–65.

van Baal 1976 J. van Baal, 'Offering, sacrifice and gift', *Numen* 23, 1976, 161–178.

Barbieri & Durand 1985 G. Barbieri & J.-L. Durand, 'Con il bue a spalla', *BdA* 70 (Nr. 29), 1985, 1–16.

Beard, North & Price 1998 M. Beard, J. North & S. Price, *Religions of Rome*, vol. 1. *A history*. Cambridge 1998.

Beckh 1895 *Geoponica sive Cassiani Bassi scholastici De re rustica eclogae* (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed.

H. Beekh. Leipzig 1895.

Beer 1914 H. Beer, *Ἀπαρχή und verwandte Ausdrücke in griechischen Weihinschriften*. Inaug. diss. Würzburg 1914.

Bekker 1814 *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. 1. *Lexica sequeiriana*, ed. I. Bekker. Berlin 1814.

Bekker 1833 *Apollonii Sophistae lexicon Homericum*, ed. I. Bekker. Berlin 1833.

Benveniste 1954 É. Benveniste, 'Problèmes sémantiques de la reconstruction', *Word* 10, 1954, 251–264.

Benner & Fobes 1949 *The letters of Alciphron, Aelian and Philostratus* (Loeb classical library), transl. A.R. Benner & F.H. Fobes. Cambridge, Mass. & London 1949.

Bérard 1982 C. Bérard, 'Récupérer la mort du prince : héroï"sation et formation de la cité', in *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, ed. G. Gnoli & J.-P. Vernant, Cambridge & Paris 1982, 89–105.

Bérard 1983 C. Bérard, 'L'héroï"sation et la formation de la cité : un conflit idéologique', in *Architecture et société de l'archai"sme grec à la fin de la république romaine. Actes du colloque international organisé par le Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et l'École française de Rome (Rome 2–4 décembre 1980)* (CEFR, 66), Rome 1983, 43–59.

Bergquist 1973 B. Bergquist, *Herakles on Thasos. The archaeological, literary and epigraphic evidence for his sanctuary, status and cult reconsidered* (Boreas, 5). Uppsala 1973.

Bergquist 1988 B. Bergquist, 'The archaeology of sacrifice: Minoan-Mycenaean versus Greek. A brief query into two sites with contrary evidence', in *Early Greek cult practice*, 21–34.

Bergquist 1990 B. Bergquist, 'Symptotic space: a functional aspect of Greek dining-rooms', in *Sympotica*, 37–65.

Bergquist 1992 B. Bergquist, 'A particular, Western Greek cult practice? The significance of *stele*-crowned, sacrificial deposits', *OpAth* 19, 1992, 41–47.

Bergquist 1993 B. Bergquist, 'Bronze Age sacrificial *koine* in the Eastern Mediterranean? A study of animal sacrifice in the ancient Near East', in *Ritual and sacrifice*, 11–43.

Bergquist 1998 B. Bergquist, 'Feasting of worshippers or temple and

sacrifice? The case of Herakleion on Thasos', in *Ancient Greek cult-practice from the archaeological evidence. Proceedings of the Fourth International Seminar on ancient Greek cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22-24 October 1993* (ActaAth-8°, 15), ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm 1998, 57-72.

Bergquist (forthcoming) B. Bergquist, 'Restudy of two Thasian instances of *enateuein*', in *Olympian and chthonian*, forthcoming.

Bernard & Salviat 1962 P. Bernard & F. Salviat, 'Inscriptions de Thasos', *BCH* 86, 1962, 578-611.

Bernard & Salviat 1967 P. Bernard & F. Salviat, 'Inscriptions de Thasos', *BCH* 91, 1967, 578-621.

Bernays 1866 J. Bernays, *Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit. Ein Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin 1866.

Berthiaume 1982 G. Berthiaume, *Les rôles du mágéiros. Étude sur la boucherie, la cuisine et le sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne* (Mnemosyne suppl., 70). Leiden 1982. Bethe 1891 E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder. Untersuchungen über die Epen des thebanisch-argivischen Sagenkreis*. Leipzig 1891.

Bethe 1900-31 *Pollucis onomasticon* (Lexicographi graeci, 9), ed. E. Bethe. Leipzig 1900-31.

Bischoff 1912 A. Bischoff, 'Hekatombaion 2', *RE* 7 (1912), 2785-2786.

Blegen, Palmer & Young 1964 C.W. Blegen, H. Palmer & R.S. Young, *Corinth XIII. The North Cemetery*. Princeton 1964.

Blinkenberg 1941 Ch. Blinkenberg, *Lindos. Fouilles de l'acropole 1902-1914 II. Inscriptions*, vol. 2. Berlin & Copenhagen 1941.

Boardman 1966 J. Boardman, 'Attic Geometric vase scenes, old and new', *JHS* 86, 1966, 1-5.

Boardman 1975 J. Boardman, *Athenian red figure vases: the Archaic period. A handbook*. London 1975.

Boardman 1990 J. Boardman, 'Herakles. VIII. Herakles' death and apotheosis', *LIMC* V:1, 1990, 121-133.

Boedeker 1993 D. Boedeker, 'Hero cult and politics in Herodotus. The bones of Orestes', in *Cultural poetics*, 164-177.

Boehringer 2001 D. Boehringer, *Heroenkulte in Griechenland von der geometrischen bis zur klassischen Zeit. Attika, Argolis, Messenien* (Klio

Beih. Neue Folge, 3). Berlin 2001.

Bohringer 1979 F. Bohringer, 'Cultes d'athlètes en Grèce classique : propos politiques, discours mythiques', *REA* 81, 1979, 5–18.

Bon & Seyrig 1929 A. Bon & H. Seyrig, 'Le sanctuaire de Poseidon à Thasos', *BCH* 53, 1929, 317–350.

Bonnechere 1994 P. Bonnechere, *Sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne* (Kernos, suppl., 3). Athens & Liège 1994. Bonnechere 1999 P. Bonnechere, '« La μάχαιρα était dissimulée dans le κανοῦν » : quelques interrogations', *REG* 101, 1999, 21–35.

Bonnet 1988 C. Bonnet, *Melqart. Cultes et mythes de l'Héraclès Tyrien en Méditerranée* (Studia phoenicia, 8 = Bibliothèque de la faculté de philosophie et lettres de Namur, 69). Leuven 1988.

Bookidis 1990 N. Bookidis, 'Ritual dining in the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth: some questions', in *Sympotica*, 86–94.

Bousquet 1992 J. Bousquet, 'Deux épigrammes grecques (Delphes, Ambracie)', *BCH* 116, 1992, 585–606.

Bowie 1970 E.L. Bowie, 'Greeks and their past in the second sophistic', *PastPres* 46, 1970, 3–41.

Bradbury 1995 S. Bradbury, 'Julian's pagan revival and the decline of blood sacrifice', *Phoenix* 49, 1995, 331–356.

Brandt 1888 *Parodorum epicorum Graecorum et Arcestrati reliquiae* (Corpusculum poesis epicae Graecae Ludibundae, 1), ed. P. Brandt. Leipzig 1888.

Brelich 1958 A. Brelich, *Gli eroi greci. Un problema storico-religioso* (Nuovi saggi, 21). Rome 1958.

Bremmer 1983a J. Bremmer, 'Scapegoat rituals in ancient Greece', *HSCP* 87, 1983, 299–320.

Bremmer 1983b J. Bremmer, *The early Greek concept of the soul*. Princeton 1983.

Brendel 1930 O. Brendel, 'Immolatio boum', *RM* 45, 1930, 196–226.

Broneer 1942 O. Broneer, 'Hero cults in the Corinthian Agora', *Hesperia* 11, 1942, 128–161.

Broneer 1959 O. Broneer, 'Excavations at Isthmia. Fourth campaign, 1957–1958', *Hesperia* 28, 1959, 298–343.

Broneer 1960 O. Broneer, 'Notes on three Athenian cult places',

ArchEph 1960, 54–67.

Broneer 1973 O. Broneer, *Isthmia II. Topography and architecture*. Princeton 1973.

Brown 1982 C. Brown, 'Dionysus and the women of Elis: PMG 871', *GRBS* 23, 1982, 305–314.

Brückner 1910 A. Brückner, 'Ἀνασθαφαὶ Κεραμείου', *Prakt* 1910 (1911), 102–111.

Bruit 1984 L. Bruit, 'Sacrifices à Delphes. Sur deux figures d'Apollon', *RHR* 201, 1984, 339–367.

Bruit 1989 L. Bruit, 'Les dieux aux festins des mortels : théoxénies et xeniai', in *Entre hommes et dieux. Le convive, le héros, le prophète* (Lire les polythéismes, 2 = Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne, 86), ed. A.-F. Laurens, Paris 1989, 13–25.

Bruit 1990 L. Bruit, 'The meal at the Hyakinthia: ritual consumption and offering', in *Sympotica*, 162–174.

Bruit Zaidman & Schmitt Pantel 1992 L. Bruit Zaidman & P. Schmitt Pantel, *Religion in the ancient Greek city*. Cambridge 1992. (Transl. by P. Cartledge of *La religion grecque*. Paris 1989.)

Bruneau 1970 Ph. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (BEFAR, 217). Paris 1970.

Brunel 1964 J. Brunel, 'Les Anténorides à Cyrène et l'interprétation littérale de Pindare, *Pythique* V, v. 82–88', *REA* 66, 1964, 5–21.

Buresch 1889 K. Buresch, *Klaros. Untersuchungen zum Orakelwesen des späteren Altertums*. Leipzig 1889.

Burford 1969 A. Burford, *The Greek temple builders at Epidauros. A social and economic study of building in the Asklepien sanctuary, during the fourth and early third centuries B.C.* (Liverpool monographs in archaeology and oriental studies). Liverpool 1969.

Burkert 1966 W. Burkert, 'Greek tragedy and sacrificial ritual', *GRBS* 7, 1966, 87–121.

Burkert 1970 W. Burkert, 'Jason, Hypsipyle, and new fire at Lemnos. A study in myth and ritual', *CQ* 20, 1970, 1–16.

Burkert 1983 W. Burkert, *Homo Necans. The anthropology of ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*. Berkeley 1983. (Transl. by P. Bing of *Homo necans. Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*

(RGVV, 32). Berlin & New York 1972.)

Burkert 1985 W. Burkert, *Greek religion. Archaic and Classical*. London 1985. (Transl. by J. Raffan of *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Die Religionen der Menschheit, 15). Stuttgart 1977.)

Burkert 1987 W. Burkert, 'Offerings in perspective: surrender, distribution, exchange', in *Gifts to the gods*, 43–50.

Bury 1890 J.B. Bury, *The Nemean odes of Pindar edited, with introductions and commentary*. London 1890.

Bury 1892 J.B. Bury, *The Isthmian odes of Pindar edited, with introduction and commentary*. London 1892.

Busolt & Swoboda 1926 G. Busolt & H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, vol. 2. *Darstellung einzelner Staaten und der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen* (HdA, 4:1:1:2). München 1926.

Bussemaker 1849 *Scholia et paraphrases in Nicandrum et Oppianum*, ed. U.C. Bussemaker, in *Scholia in Theocritum*, ed. F. Dübner. Paris 1849.

Butz 1994 P. Butz, 'The double publication of a sacred prohibition on Delos: ID 68, A and B', *BCH* 118, 1994, 69–98.

Butz 1996 P. Butz, 'Prohibitory inscriptions, ξένοι, and the influence of the early Greek polis', in *Role of religion in the early Greek polis*, 75–95.

CAF Comitorum atticorum fragmenta, vol. 3, ed. T. Kock. Leipzig 1888.

Calabi Limentani 1976 I. Calabi Limentani, 'Armodio e Aristogitone, gli uccisi dal tiranno', *Acme* 29, 1976, 9–27.

Caltabiano 1992 M.C. Caltabiano, 'Leukaspis', *LIMC* VI:1, 1992, 273–274.

Campbell 1991 *Greek lyric*, vol. 3. *Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and others* (Loeb classical library), ed. and transl. D.A. Campbell. Cambridge, Mass. & London 1991.

Carter 1998 *The chora of Metaponto. The necropoleis*, vols. 1–2, ed. J.C. Carter. Austin 1998.

Cartledge 1978 P. Cartledge, 'Literacy in the Spartan oligarchy', *JHS* 98, 1978, 25–37.

Cartledge 1988 P. Cartledge, 'Yes, Spartan kings were heroized', *LCM* 13.3, 1988, 43–44.

Cartledge & Spawforth 1989 P. Cartledge & A. Spawforth, *Hellenistic*

and Roman Sparta. A tale of two cities (States and cities of ancient Greece). London & New York 1989.

Casabona 1966 J. Casabona, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec des origines à la fin de l'époque classique* (Publication des Annales de la Faculté des Lettres, Aix-en-Provence, N.S., 56). Aix-en Provence 1966.

Casevitz 1988 M. Casevitz, 'Sur quelques désignations d'autels (premiers emplois des mots)', *Bulletin de liaison de la société des amis de la Bibliothèque Salomon- Reinach* 6, 1988, 57–63.

Cassimatis 1988 H. Cassimatis, 'À propos de l'utilisation du motif iconographique : auteltrône ? une bizarrerie de l'imagerie', in *Proceedings of the 3rd symposium on ancient Greek and related pottery. Copenhagen August 31–September 4, 1987*, eds. J. Christiansen & T. Melander, Copenhagen 1988, 117–129.

Catling 1976–77 H. Catling, 'Excavations at the Menelaion', *AR* 1976–77, 24–42.

Catling & Cavanagh 1976 H.W. Catling & H. Cavanagh, 'Two inscribed bronzes from the Menelaion, Sparta', *Kadmos* 15, 1976, 145–157.

Cavanagh 1996 W. Cavanagh, 'The burial customs', in *Knossos North Cemetery. Early Greek tombs*, vol. 2. *Discussion* (BSA suppl., 28), eds. J.N. Coldstream & H.W. Catling, Athens 1996, 651–675.

Cerfaux & Tondriau 1957 L. Cerfaux, & J. Tondriau, *Un concurrent du christianisme. Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine* (Bibliothèque de théologie, sér. 3:5). Tournai 1957.

Chadwick 1986 J. Chadwick, 'The semantic history of Greek ἐσχάρᾱ', in *O-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Etter, Berlin & New York 1986, 515–523.

Chadwick 1996 *Lexicographia graeca. Contributions to the lexicography of ancient Greece*, ed. J. Chadwick. Oxford 1996.

Chambers 1986 *Aristoteles. Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. M. Chambers. Leipzig 1986.

Chamoux 1949 F. Chamoux, 'Les Anténorides à Cyrène', in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à Charles Picard à l'occasion de son 65e anniversaire* (= REG 29, 1948), Paris 1949, 154–161.

Chaniotis 1991 A. Chaniotis, 'Gedenktage der Griechen. Ihre

Bedeutung für das Geschichtsbewußtsein griechischer Poleis', in *Das Fest und das Heilige. Religiöse Kontrapunkte zur Alltagswelt* (Studien zum Verstehen fremder Religionen, 1), ed. J. Assmann & Th. Sundermeier, Gütersloher 1991, 123–145.

Chantraine 1968–80 P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, vols. 1–5. Paris 1968–80.

Chantraine & Masson 1954 P. Chantraine & O. Masson, 'Sur quelques termes du vocabulaire religieux des Grecs : la valeur du mot . ἄγος et de ses dérivés', in *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung. Festschrift Albert Debrunner gewidmet von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*, Bern 1954, 85–107.

Chatzis 1914 A. Chatzis, *Der Philosoph und Grammatiker Ptolemaios Chennos. Leben, Schriftstellerei und Fragmente* (mit Ausschluss der Aristotelesbiographie), vol. 1. *Einleitung und Text* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, 7:2). Paderborn 1914.

Christopoulos 1994 M. Christopoulos, 'Poseidon Erechtheus and ΕΡΕΧΘΙΣΘΑΛΑΣΣΑ', in *Epigraphical evidence*, 123–130.

Citron 1965 A. Citron, *Semantische Untersuchung zu σπένδεσθαι – σπένδειν – εὔχεσθαι*. Inaug. diss. Winterthur 1965.

Clairmont 1971 Ch.W. Clairmont, 'Euripides' *Erechtheus* and the *Erechtheion*', *GRBS* 12, 1971, 485–493.

Clairmont 1983 Ch.W. Clairmont, *Patrios nomos. Public burial in Athens during the fifth and fourth centuries BC. The archaeological, epigraphic-literary and historical evidence* (BAR-IS, 161:1–2). Oxford 1983.

Clinton 1971 K. Clinton, 'Inscriptions from Eleusis', *ArchEph* 1971, 81–136.

Clinton 1979 K. Clinton, 'IG I² 5, the Eleusinia and the Eleusinians', *AJP* 100, 1979, 1–12.

Clinton 1988 K. Clinton, 'Sacrifice at the Eleusinian mysteries', in *Early Greek cult practice*, 69–80.

Clinton 1992 K. Clinton, *Myth and cult. The iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries. The Martin P. Nilsson lectures on Greek religion, delivered 19–21 November 1990 at the Swedish Institute at Athens* (ActaAth-8°, 11). Stockholm 1992.

Clinton 1996 K. Clinton, 'A new *lex sacra* from Selinus: kindly Zeuses, Eumenides, impure and pure Tritopatores, and elasteroi', *CP* 91, 1996,

Coldstream 1976 J.N. Coldstream, 'Hero-cults in the age of Homer', *JHS* 96, 1976, 8–17.

Collard 1995 C. Collard, 'Cretans', in *Euripides. Selected fragmentary plays with introductions, translations and commentaries*, vol. 1. *Telephus, Cretans, Stheneboea, Bellerophon, Cresphontes, Erechtheus, Phaethon, Wise Melanippe, Captive Melanippe* (The plays of Euripides. Selected fragmentary plays, 1), Warminster 1995, 53–78.

Combs-Schilling 1989 M.E. Combs-Schilling, *Sacred performances. Islam, sexuality, and sacrifice*. New York 1989.

Connelly 1996 J.B. Connelly, 'Parthenon and the parthenoi: a mythological interpretation of the Parthenon frieze', *AJA* 100, 1996, 53–80.

Connolly 1998 A. Connolly, 'Was Sophocles heroised as Dexion?', *JHS* 118, 1998, 1–21.

Conomis 1970 *Lycurgi Oratio in Leocratem. Cum ceterarum Lycurgi orationum fragmentis* (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. N.C. Conomis. Leipzig 1970.

Cook 1940 A.B. Cook, *Zeus. A study in ancient religion*, vol. 3. *Zeus god of the dark sky (earthquakes, clouds, wind, dew, rain, meteorites)*. Cambridge 1940.

Cooper & Morris 1990 F. Cooper & S. Morris, 'Dining in round buildings', in *Sympotica*, 66–85.

Cornell 1981 T. Cornell, 'Some observations on the "crimen incesti"', in *Le délit religieux dans la cité antique. Table ronde, Rome, 6–7 avril 1978* (CEFR, 48), Rome 1981, 27–37.

Courby 1912 F. Courby, *Exploration archéologique de Délos V. Le portique d'Antigone ou du nord-est et les constructions voisines*. Paris 1912.

Craik 1980 E.M. Craik, *The Dorian Aegean* (States and cities of ancient Greece). London 1980.

Creuzer 1842 F. Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker besonders der Griechen*³, vol. 3 (= *Deutsche Schriften, neue und verbesserte*, 1:3). Leipzig & Darmstadt 1842.

Cropp 1995 M.J. Cropp, 'Erechtheus', in *Euripides. Selected fragmentary plays with introductions, translations and commentaries*, vol. 1. *Telephus,*

Cretans, Stheneboea, Bellerophon, Cresphontes, Erechtheus, Phaethon, Wise Melanippe, Captive Melanippe (The plays of Euripides. Selected fragmentary plays, 1), Warminster 1995, 148–194.

Crosby 1949 M. Crosby, 'The altar of the Twelve Gods in Athens', in *Commemorative studies in honor of Theodore Leslie Shear* (Hesperia suppl., 8), Athens 1949, 82–103.

Crugnola 1971 *Scholia in Nikandri Theriaca cum glossis* (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità, 34), ed. A. Crugnola. Milan 1971.

Cuisine of sacrifice The cuisine of sacrifice among the Greeks, eds. M. Detienne & J.-P. Vernant. Chicago & London 1989. (Transl. by P. Wissing of *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*. Paris 1979.)

Cultural poetics Cultural poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, performance, politics, eds. C. Dougherty & L. Kurke. Cambridge 1993.

Cumont 1949 F. Cumont, *Lux perpetua*. Paris 1949.

Dahl & Hjort 1976 G. Dahl & A. Hjort, *Having herds. Pastoral herd growth and household economy* (Stockholm studies in social anthropology, 2). Stockholm 1976.

Dalby 1996 A. Dalby, *Siren feasts. A history of food and gastronomy in Greece*. London & New York 1996.

Daux 1962 G. Daux, 'Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1961. Délos, Archégésion', *BCH* 86, 1962, 959–963.

Daux 1963a G. Daux, 'La grande démarchie : un nouveau calendrier sacrificiel d'Attique (Erchia)', *BCH* 87, 1963, 603–634.

Daux 1963b G. Daux, 'Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques en Grèce en 1962. Délos, Archégésion', *BCH* 87, 1963, 862–869.

Daux 1983 G. Daux, 'Le calendrier de Thorikos au Musée J. Paul Getty', *AntCl* 52, 1983, 150–174.

Daux 1984 G. Daux, 'Sacrifices à Thorikos', *GettyMusJ* 12, 1984, 145–152.

Dear 1931 H.Th. Dear, 'The scholia vetera to Pindar', *HSCP* 42, 1931, 1–78.

Defradas 1952 J. Defradas, 'Le culte des Anténorides à Cyrène', *REG* 65,

1952, 289–301.

Deneken 1886–90 F. Deneken, 'Heros', in *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. 1:2, 2441–2589.

Denniston 1939 *Euripides. Electra*, ed. J.D. Denniston. Oxford 1939.

Dentzer 1982 J.-M. Dentzer, *Le motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde grec du viie au ive siècle avant J.-C.* (BEFAR, 246). Rome 1982.

Deonna 1939 W. Deonna, 'Croyances funéraires. La soif des morts. Le mort musicien', *RHR* 119, 1939, 53–81.

De Schutter 1996 X. De Schutter, 'La marmite et la panspermie des morts', *Kernos* 9, 1996, 333–345.

Des Courtils, Gordeisen & Pariente 1996 J. Des Courtils, A. Gordeisen & A. Pariente, 'Sacrifices d'animaux à Hérakleion de Thasos', *BCH* 120, 1996, 799–820.

Detienne 1989a M. Detienne, 'Culinary practices and the spirit of sacrifice', in *Cuisine of sacrifice*, 1–20.

Detienne 1989b M. Detienne, 'The violence of wellborn ladies: women in the Thesmophoria', in *Cuisine of sacrifice*, 129–147.

Deubner 1969 L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*. Hildesheim 1969.

Dihle 1959 A. Dihle, 'Ptolemaios 79', *RE* 23:2 (1959), 1863.

Dindorf 1829 *Aristides opera omnia*, ed. W. Dindorf. Leipzig 1829.

Dindorf 1851 *Aeschyli tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta*, vol. 3. *Scholia graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata*, ed. W. Dindorf. Oxford 1851.

Dindorf 1853 *Harpocratonis lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*, ed. W. Dindorf. Oxford 1853.

Dindorf 1855 *Scholia graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, vol. 1, ed. W. Dindorf. Oxford 1855.

Dindorf 1875 *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 1, ed. W. Dindorf. Oxford 1875.

Divakaran 1982 S. Divakaran, *Animal blood processing and utilization* (FAO agricultural series bulletin, 32). Rome 1982.

Dörpfeld 1892 W. Dörpfeld, 'Das Pelopion-Thor', in *Olympia. Die Ergebnisse der von dem Deutschen Reich veranstalteten Ausgrabung II. Die Baudenkmäler von Olympia*, eds. E. Curtius & F. Alder, Berlin 1892, 56–

Dörpfeld 1935 W. Dörpfeld, *Alt-Olympia I. Untersuchungen und Ausgrabungen zur Geschichte des älteren Heiligtum von Olympia und der älteren griechischen Kunst*. Berlin 1935.

Dörpfeld 1937 W. Dörpfeld, *Alt-Athen und seine Agora. Untersuchungen über die Entwicklung der ältesten Burg und Stadt Athen und ihres politischen Mittelpunktes, des Stadtmarktes*. Berlin 1937.

Dow 1942 S. Dow, 'Corinthia 5. The paucity of inscriptions from ante-146 BC', *HSCP* 53, 1942, 113–119.

Dow 1965 S. Dow, 'The Greater Demarkhia of Erkhia', *BCH* 89, 1965, 180–213.

Dow 1968 S. Dow, 'Six Athenian sacrificial calendars', *BCH* 92, 1968, 170–186.

Dow & Healey 1965 S. Dow & R.F. Healey, *A sacred calendar of Eleusis* (= *HTHR* 21, 1965). Cambridge, Mass. 1965.

Drachmann 1903–27 *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, vols. 1–3 (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. A.B. Drachmann. Leipzig 1903–27.

Drew-Bear 1980 T. Drew-Bear, 'An act of foundation at Hypaipa', *Chiron* 10, 1980, 509–536.

Dubois 1989 L. Dubois, *Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile : contribution à l'étude du vocabulaire grec colonial* (CEFR, 119). Rome 1989.

Dunant & Pouilloux 1958 Ch. Dunant & J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, vol. 2. De 196 avant J.-C. jusqu'à la fin de l'antiquité (Études thasiennes, 5). Paris 1958.

Dunst 1964 G. Dunst, 'Leukaspis', *BCH* 88, 1964, 482–485.

Dunst 1972 G. Dunst, 'Archaische Inschriften und Dokumente der Pentekontaetie aus Samos', *AM* 87, 1972, 99–163.

Durand 1986 J.-L. Durand, *Sacrifice et labour en Grèce ancienne. Essai d'anthropologie religieuse* (Images à l'appui, 1). Paris & Rome 1986.

Durand 1989a J.-L. Durand, 'Greek animals: toward a topology of edible bodies', in *Cuisine of sacrifice*, 87–118.

Durand 1989b J.-L. Durand, 'Ritual as instrumentality', in *Cuisine of sacrifice*, 119–128.

Durand 1991 J.-L. Durand, 'Images pour un autel', in *L'espace sacrificiel*,

Durand 1996 J.-L. Durand, 'La mort, les morts et le reste', in *Destins de meurtriers* (Systèmes de pensée en Afrique noire 14, 1996), Paris 1996, 39-56.

Durand & Lissarrague 1999 J.-L. Durand & F. Lissarrague, 'Mourir à l'autel. Remarques sur l'imagerie du « sacrifice humain » dans la céramique attique', *ArchRG* 1, 1999, 83-106.

Durand-Tullou 1976 A. Durand-Tullou, 'L'élevage du porc et la charcuterie dans la zone montagneuse du Gard, au début du xx^e siècle', *Ethnozootechnie* 16, 1976, 88-99.

Durling 1993 R.J. Durling, *A dictionary of medical terms in Galen* (Studies in ancient medicine, 5). Leiden 1993.

Dyggve 1960 E. Dyggve, *Lindos. Fouilles de l'acropole 1902-1914 et 1952 III. Le sanctuaire d'Athana Lindia et l'architecture lindienne*. Berlin 1960.

Early Greek cult practice Early Greek cult practice. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26-29 June, 1986* (ActaAth-4°, 38), eds. R. Hägg, N. Marinatos & G.C. Nordquist. Stockholm 1988.

Edelstein & Edelstein 1945 E.J. Edelstein & L. Edelstein, *Asclepius. A collection and interpretation of the testimonies*, vol. 2 (Publications of the Institute of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, 2nd series: texts and documents). Baltimore 1945.

Edmonds 1961 J.M. Edmonds, *The fragments of Attic comedy after Meinecke, Bergk, and Kock, augmented, newly edited with their contexts, annotated, and completely translated into English verse*, vol. 3b. Menander. Leiden 1961.

Edmunds 1981 L. Edmunds, 'The cults and the legend of Oedipus', *HSCP* 85, 1981, 221-238.

Eitrem 1912 S. Eitrem, 'Heros', *RE* 8:1 (1912), 1111-1145.

Eitrem 1915 S. Eitrem, *Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer* (Videnskapsselskapets skrifter, 2. Hist.-filos. klasse, 1914:1). Kristiania 1915.

Ekroth 1996 G. Ekroth, 'The Berbati-Limnes archaeological survey. The Late Geometric and Archaic periods', in *The Berbati-Limnes archaeological survey 1988-1990* (ActaAth-4°, 44), ed. B. Wells, Stockholm 1996, 179-227.

Ekroth 1997–98 G. Ekroth, 'Review of C. Antonaccio, *An archaeology of ancestors: tomb cult and hero cult in early Greece*', *OpAth* 22–23, 1997–98, 160–162.

Ekroth 1998 G. Ekroth, 'Altars in Greek hero-cults: a review of the archaeological evidence', in *Ancient Greek cult-practice from the archaeological evidence. Proceedings of the Fourth International Seminar on ancient Greek cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22–24 October 1993* (*ActaAth-8°*, 15), ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm 1998, 117–130.

Ekroth 1999 G. Ekroth, 'Pausanias and the sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults', in *Ancient Greek hero cult*, 145–158.

Ekroth 2000 G. Ekroth, 'Offerings of blood in Greek hero-cults', in *Héros et héros*, 263–280.

Ekroth 2001 G. Ekroth, 'Altars on Attic vases: the identification of *bomos* and *eschara*', in *Ceramics in context. Proceedings of the Internordic colloquium on ancient pottery held at Stockholm 13–15 June 1997* (*Acta univ. Stock.* Stockholm studies in classical archaeology, 12), ed. Ch. Scheffer, Stockholm 2001, 115–126.

Elsner 1992 J. Elsner, 'Pausanias: a Greek pilgrim in the Roman world', *PastPres* 135, 1992, 3–29.

Epigraphical evidence Ancient Greek cult practice from the epigraphical evidence. Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on ancient Greek cult, organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22–24 November 1991 (*ActaAth-8°*, 13), ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm 1994.

Erbse 1965 H. Erbse, 'Scholien', *Lexikon der alten Welt*, Zürich & Stuttgart 1965, 2723–2725.

Erbse 1969–88 *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia vetera)*, vols. 1–7, ed. H. Erbse. Berlin 1969–88.

L'espace sacrificiel L'espace sacrificiel dans les civilisations méditerranéennes de l'antiquité. Actes du colloque tenu à la Maison de l'Orient, Lyon, 4–7 juin 1988 (Publications de la Bibliothèque Salomon-Reinach, 5), eds. R. Étienne, & M.-Th. Le Dinahet. Paris 1991.

Étienne & Braun 1986 R. Étienne & J.-P. Braun, *Ténos I. Le sanctuaire de Poseidon et d'Amphitrite* (BEFAR, 263). Paris 1986.

Étienne & Piérart 1975 R. Étienne & M. Piérart, 'Un décret du Koinon des Hellènes à Platées en l'honneur de Glaucon, fils d'Étéoclés, d'Athènes', *BCH* 99, 1975, 51–75.

- Evans-Pritchard 1956 E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Nuer religion*. Oxford 1956.
- Faraone 1993 Ch.A. Faraone, 'Molten wax, spilt wine and mutilated animals: sympathetic magic in Near Eastern and early Greek oath ceremonies', *JHS* 113, 1993, 60–80.
- Farnell 1921 L.R. Farnell, *Greek hero cult and ideas of immortality*. Oxford 1921.
- Farnell 1932 L.R. Farnell, *The works of Pindar. Translated, with literary and critical commentaries*, vol. 2. *Critical commentary*. London 1932.
- Ferguson 1938 W.S. Ferguson, 'The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion', *Hesperia* 7, 1938, 1–74.
- Ferguson 1944 W.S. Ferguson, 'The Attic orgeones', *HThR* 37, 1944, 61–140.
- Fontenrose 1960 J. Fontenrose, *The cult and myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi* (University of California publications in Classical archaeology, 4:3). Berkeley & Los Angeles 1960.
- Fontenrose 1968 J. Fontenrose, 'The hero as athlete', *CSCA* 1, 1968, 73–104.
- Fontenrose 1978 J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic oracle: its responses and operations with a catalogue of responses*. Berkeley 1978.
- Foucart 1918 M.P. Foucart, *Le culte des héros chez les grecs* (Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 42). Paris 1918.
- Fraser 1977 P.M. Fraser, *Rhodian funerary monuments*. Oxford 1977.
- Fredricksmeyer 1981 E.A. Fredricksmeyer, 'On the background of the ruler cult', in *Ancient Macedonian studies in honour of Charles F. Edson*, Thessaloniki 1981, 145–156.
- Frisch 1978 *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos* (IK, 6), ed. P. Frisch. Bonn 1978.
- von Fritze 1903 H. von Fritze, 'Zum griechischen Opferritual. Αἵρεσθαι und καταστρέφειν', *Jdl* 18, 1903, 58–67.
- Fuqua 1981 Ch. Fuqua, 'Tyrtaeus and the cult of heroes', *GRBS* 22, 1981, 215–226.
- Furtwängler 1890 A. Furtwängler, *Olympia. Die Ergebnisse der von dem Deutschen Reich veranstalteten Ausgrabung IV. Die Bronzen und die übrigen kleineren Funde von Olympia*. Berlin 1890.
- Furtwängler & Reichhold 1900 A. Furtwängler & K. Reichhold,

Griechische Vasenmalerei. Auswahl hervorragender Vasenbilder, vol. 1. München 1900.

Gadbery 1992 L.M. Gadbery, 'The sanctuary of the Twelve Gods in the Athenian Agora: a revised view', *Hesperia* 61, 1992, 447–489.

Gager 1992 *Curse tablets and binding spells from the ancient world*, ed. J. Gager. New York & Oxford 1992.

Gallet de Santerre 1958 H. Gallet de Santerre, *Délos primitive et archaïque* (BEFAR, 192). Paris 1958.

Gaisford 1848 *Etymologicum Magnum*, ed. T. Gaisford. Oxford 1848.

Garland 1985 R. Garland, *The Greek way of death*. London 1985.

Garland 1987 R. Garland, *The Piraeus from the fifth to the first century BC*. London 1987.

Gauthier 1985 P. Gauthier, *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (ive-ier siècle avant J.-C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions* (BCH suppl., 12). Paris 1985.

Gebhard 1993a E.R. Gebhard, 'The Isthmian games and the sanctuary of Poseidon in the early empire', in *The Corinthia in the Roman period. Including papers given at a symposium held at the Ohio State University on 7–9 March, 1991* (JRA suppl., 8), ed. T.E. Gregory, Ann Arbor 1993, 78–94.

Gebhard 1993b E.R. Gebhard, 'The evolution of a pan-Hellenic sanctuary: from archaeology towards history at Isthmia', in *Greek sanctuaries. New approaches*, eds. N. Marinatos & R. Hägg, London & New York 1993, 154–177.

Gebhard & Dickie 1999 E.R. Gebhard & M.W. Dickie, 'Melikertes-Palaimon, hero of the Isthmian games', in *Ancient Greek hero cult*, 159–165.

Gebhard & Reese (forthcoming) E.R. Gebhard & D.S. Reese, 'Sacrifices for Poseidon and Melikertes-Palaimon at Isthmia', in *Olympian and chthonian*, forthcoming.

Gegan 1989 D.J. Gegan, 'The Isthmian dossier of P. Licinius Priscus Juventianus', *Hesperia* 58, 1989, 349–360.

Georgoudi 1988 S. Georgoudi, 'Commémoration et célébration des mort dans les cités grecques : les rites annuels', in *La commémoration. Colloque du centenaire de la section des sciences religieuses de l'École*

pratique des hautes études (Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études, 91), ed. Ph. Gignoux, Louvain & Paris 1988, 73–89.

Georgoudi 1989 S. Georgoudi, 'Sanctified slaughter in modern Greece: the "kourbânia" of the saints', in *Cuisine of sacrifice*, 183–203.

Gerber 1982 D.E. Gerber, *Pindar's Olympian one: a commentary* (Phoenix suppl., 15). Toronto 1982.

Gifts to the gods Gifts to the gods. Proceedings of the Uppsala symposium 1985 (Boreas, 15), eds. T. Linders & G. Nordquist. Uppsala 1987.

Gill 1974 D.H. Gill, 'Trapezomata: a neglected aspect of Greek sacrifice', *HThR* 67, 1974, 117–137.

Gill 1991 D.H. Gill, *Greek cult tables* (Harvard dissertations in classics). New York & London 1991.

Gladigow 1984 B. Gladigow, 'Die Teilung des Opfers. Zur Interpretation von Opfern in vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Epoken', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 18, 1984, 19–43.

Gomme 1956a A.W. Gomme, *A historical commentary on Thucydides. The ten years' war*, vol. 2. Books 2–3. Oxford 1956.

Gomme 1956b A.W. Gomme, *A historical commentary on Thucydides. The ten years' war*, vol. 3. Books 4–5.24. Oxford 1956.

Gould 1994 J. Gould, 'Herodotus and religion', in *Greek historiography*, ed. S. Hornblower, Oxford 1994, 91–106.

Gow 1912 A.F.S. Gow, 'On the meaning of the word θυμέλη', *JHS* 32, 1912, 213–238.

Graf 1974 F. Graf, 'Zum Opferkalender des Nichomachos', *ZPE* 14, 1974, 139–144.

Graf 1980 F. Graf, 'Milch, Honig und Wein. Zum Verständnis der Libation im griechischen Ritual', in *Perennitas. Studi in onore di Angelo Brelich. Promossi dalla Cattedra di religioni del mondo classico dell'Università degli studi di Roma*, Rome 1980, 209–221.

Graf 1985 F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte: religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia* (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana, 21). Rome 1985.

Graf 1991 F. Graf, 'Prayer in magic and religious ritual', in *Magika hiera. Ancient Greek magic and religion*, eds. Ch.A. Faraone & D. Obbink,

New York & Oxford 1991, 188–213.

Graf 1995 F. Graf, 'Bemerkungen zur bürgerlichen Religiosität im Zeitalter des Hellenismus', in *Stadt und Bürger im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993* (Vestigia, 47), eds. M. Wörle & P. Zanker, München 1995, 103–114.

Graf 1996 F. Graf, 'Pompai in Greece. Some considerations about space and ritual in the Greek polis', in *Role of religion in the early Greek polis*, 55–65.

Greene 1938 *Scholia platonica* (Philological monographs published by the American philological association, 8), ed. G.C. Greene. Haverford 1938.

Griffiths 1985 A. Griffiths, 'A ram called Patroklos', *BICS* 32, 1985, 49–50.

Griffiths 1989 A. Griffiths, 'Patroklos the ram (again)', *BICS* 36, 1989, 139.

Grimm 1996 V.E. Grimm, *From feasting to fasting, the evolution of a sin. Attitudes to food in late antiquity*. London & New York 1996.

Grottanelli & Parise 1988 *Sacrificio e società nel mondo antico* (Collezione storica), eds. C. Grottanelli & N.F. Parise. Bari 1988.

Guarducci 1974 M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca*, vol. 3. *Epigrafi di carattere privato*. Rome 1974.

Le Guen-Pollet 1991 B. Le Guen-Pollet, 'Espace sacrificiel et corps des bêtes immolées. Remarques sur le vocabulaire désignant la part du prêtre dans la Grèce antique, de l'époque classique à l'époque impériale', in *L'espace sacrificiel*, 13–23.

*Guide de Délos*³ 1983 Ph. Bruneau & J. Ducat, *Guide de Délos* (Sites et monuments, 1). Paris 1983.

Gulick 1930 *Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists*, vol. 4 (Loeb classical library), transl. Ch.B. Gulick. London & New York 1930.

Habicht 1970 Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*² (Zetemata, 14). Munich 1970.

Hadzisteliou-Price 1973 Th. Hadzisteliou-Price, 'Hero-cult and Homer', *Historia* 22, 1973, 129–144.

Hadzisteliou-Price 1979 Th. Hadzisteliou-Price, 'Hero cult in the "Age of Homer" and earlier', in *Arktouros: Hellenic studies presented to*

Bernard M.W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday, ed. G.W. Bowersock, Berlin & New York 1979, 219–228.

Hägg 1983 R. Hägg, 'Funerary meals in the Geometric necropolis at Asine?', in *The Greek renaissance of the eighth century B.C.: tradition and innovation. Proceedings of the Second International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 1–5 June, 1981* (ActaAth-4°, 30), ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm 1983, 189–193.

Hägg 1987 R. Hägg, 'Gifts to the heroes in Geometric and Archaic Greece', in *Gifts to the gods*, 93–99.

Halleran 1995 M.R. Halleran, *Euripides. Hippolytus, with introduction, translation and commentary* (The plays of Euripides). Warminster 1995.

Halleux & Schamp 1985 *Les lapidaires grecs* (Collection des universités de France), ed. and transl. R. Halleux & J. Schamp. Paris 1985.

Hampe 1967 R. Hampe, 'Kult der Winde in Athen und Kreta', *SBHeid* 1, 1967, 7–27.

Hardacre 1987 H. Hardacre, 'Ancestor worship', in *The encyclopedia of religion*, vol. 1, ed. M. Eliade, New York 1987, 263–268.

Harrison J. 1922 J.E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the study of Greek religion*³. Cambridge 1922.

Harrison S. 1989 S.J. Harrison, 'Sophokles and the cult of Philoktetes', *JHS* 109, 1989, 173–175.

Hausrath 1962 *Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum*, vol. 1 (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. A. Hausrath. Leipzig 1962.

Healey 1964 R.F. Healey, S.J., 'A sacrifice without a deity in the Athenian state calendar', *HTHR* 57, 1964, 153–159.

Healey 1984 R.F. Healey, S.J., 'A generic sacrifice list in the Athenian state calendar', in *Studies presented to Sterling Dow on his eightieth birthday* (GRBM, 10), Durham 1984, 135–141.

Hedreen 1991 G. Hedreen, 'The cult of Achilles in the Euxine', *Hesperia* 60, 1991, 313–330.

Hedrick 1994 Ch.W. Hedrick, Jr., 'Writing, reading, and democracy', in *Ritual, finance, politics*, 157–174.

Heikkilä (forthcoming) K. Heikkilä, 'Ekphora in Greek burial laws', in *Gender, culture and religion in antiquity. Proceedings of the second Nordic*

symposium on women's lives in antiquity, Helsinki 20–22 October 2000, eds. L. Larsson Lovén & A. Strömberg, forthcoming.

Hellmann 1992 M.-Ch. Hellmann, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire de l'architecture grecque d'après les inscriptions de Délos* (BEFAR, 278). Paris 1992.

Hemberg 1954 B. Hemberg, 'Τριπᾶτωρ und τρισήρωσ. Griechischer Ahnenkult in klassischer und mykenischer Zeit', *Eranos* 52, 1954, 172–190.

Henninger 1987 J. Henninger, 'Sacrifice', in *The encyclopedia of religion*, vol. 12, ed. M. Eliade, New York 1987, 544–557.

Henrichs 1969 A. Henrichs, 'Μέγαρον im Orakel des Apollon', *ZPE* 4, 1969, 31–37.

Henrichs 1981 A. Henrichs, 'Human sacrifice in Greek religion: three case studies', in *Sacrifice dans l'antiquité*, 195–235 (discussion 236–247).

Henrichs 1983 A. Henrichs, 'The "sobriety" of Oedipus: Sophocles OC 100 misunderstood', *HSCP* 87, 1983, 87–100.

Henrichs 1984 A. Henrichs, 'The Eumenides and wineless libations in the Derveni papyrus', in *Atti del XVII congresso internazionale di papirologia (Napoli, 19–26 maggio 1983)*, vol. 2. *Papirologia letteraria. Testi e documenti egiziani*, Naples 1984, 255–268.

Henrichs 1991 A. Henrichs, 'Namenlosigkeit und Euphemismus: zur Ambivalenz der chthonischen Mächte im attischen Drama', in *Fragmenta Dramatica. Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte*, eds. A. Harder & H. Hofmann, Göttingen 1991, 161–201.

Henrichs 1998 A. Henrichs, 'Dromena und Legomena. Zum rituellen Selbstverständnis der Griechen', in *Ansichten griechischer Rituale. Geburtstags-Symposium für Walter Burkert, Castelen bei Basel 15. bis 18. März 1996*, ed. F. Graf, Stuttgart 1998, 33–71.

Herington 1972 *The older scholia on the Prometheus bound*, ed. C.J. Herington. Leiden 1972.

Hermann 1846 K.F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der gottesdienstlichen Alterthümer der Griechen*, vol. 2. *Die gottesdienstlichen Alterthümer*. Heidelberg 1846.

Hermay 1986 A. Hermay, 'Dioskouroi', *LIMC* III:1, 1986, 567–593.

Héros et héroï"nes Héros et héroï"nes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs. Actes du Colloque organisé à l'Université de Valladolid du 26 au 29 mai 1999 (Kernos suppl., 10), eds. V. Pirenne-Delforge & E. Suárez de la Torre. Liège 2000.

Herrmann H. 1980 H.-V. Herrmann, 'Pelops in Olympia', in ΣΤΗΛΗ. Τόμος εις μνήμην, Νικολάου Κοντολέοντος Athens 1980, 59–74.

Herrmann P. 1995 P. Herrmann, 'Τέρας θανόντων – Totenruhm und Totenehrung im städtischen Leben der hellenistischen Zeit', in *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993* (Vestigia, 47), eds. M. Wörle & P. Zanker, München 1995, 189–197.

Herzog 1928 R. Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos* (AbhBerlin, 6). Berlin 1928.

Heubeck & Hoekstra 1989 A. Heubeck & A. Hoekstra, *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 2. Books IX–XVI. Oxford 1989.

Heylbut 1887 G. Heylbut, 'Ptolemaeus Περὶ διαφορᾶς', *Hermes* 22, 1887, 388–410.

Hiller von Gaertringen 1906 F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Inscriptionen von Priene*. Berlin 1906.

Himmelman 1997 N. Himmelman, *Tieropfer in der griechischen Kunst* (Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vorträge G 349). Opladen 1997.

Höfer 1894–97 O. Höfer, 'Laertiades', in *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. 2, 1788.

Hoffmann 1997 H. Hoffmann, *Sotades. Symbols of immortality on Greek vases*. Oxford 1997.

Hollis 1990 A. Hollis, 'Epops in the Erchian sacred calendar and the Aetia of Callimachus', in 'Owls to Athens'. *Essays on classical subjects presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, ed. E.M. Craik, Oxford 1990, 127–130.

Hommel 1980 H. Hommel, *Der Gott Achilleus* (SBHeid, 1980:1). Heidelberg 1980.

van Hoof 1990 A.J.L. van Hoof, *From autothanasia to suicide. Selfkilling in Classical antiquity*. London & New York 1990.

Hornblower 1991 S. Hornblower, *A commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1. Books I–III. Oxford 1991.

Hornblower 1996 S. Hornblower, *A commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 2. Books IV–V.24. Oxford 1996.

Houby-Nielsen 1996 S. Houby-Nielsen, 'The archaeology of ideology in the Kerameikos: new interpretations of the "Opferrinnen"', in *Role of religion in the early Greek polis*, 41–54.

Hubert & Mauss 1964 H. Hubert & M. Mauss, *Sacrifice: its nature and functions*. Chicago 1964. (Transl. by W.D. Halls of 'Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice', *L'année sociologique* 2, 1898, 29–138.)

Hude 1927 *Scholia in Thucydidem* (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. K. Hude. Leipzig 1927.

Hughes 1991 D.D. Hughes, *Human sacrifice in ancient Greece*. London & New York 1991.

Hughes (forthcoming) D.D. Hughes, 'Sacrifice and the cult of the dead in ancient Argos', in *Olympian and chthonian*, forthcoming.

Humphreys 1980 S.C. Humphreys, 'Family tombs and tomb cult in ancient Athens: tradition or traditionalism?', *JHS* 100, 1980, 96–126.

Hurwit 1999 J.M. Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis. History, mythology, and archaeology from the Neolithic era to the present*. Cambridge 1999.

Hutchinson 1985 *Aeschylus. Septem contra Thebas*, ed. G.O. Hutchinson. Oxford 1985.

IK *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*.

Isenberg 1975 M. Isenberg, 'The sale of sacrificial meat', *CP* 70, 1975, 271–273.

Jacoby 1944 F. Jacoby, 'Patrios nomos: state burial in Athens and the public cemetery in the Kerameikos', *JHS* 64, 1944, 37–66.

Jameson 1951 M.H. Jameson, 'The hero Echetlaeus', *TAPA* 82, 1951, 49–61. Jameson 1965 M.H. Jameson, 'Notes on the sacrificial calendar from Erchia', *BCH* 89, 1965, 154–172.

Jameson 1986 M.H. Jameson, 'Sophocles, *Antigone* 1005–1022: an illustration', in *Greek tragedy and its legacy: essays presented to D.J. Conacher*, eds. M. Cropp, E. Fantham & S.E. Scully, Calgary 1986, 59–65.

Jameson 1988 M.H. Jameson, 'Sacrifice and animal husbandry in Classical Greece', in *Pastoral economies in Classical antiquity* (ProcCambrPhilSoc suppl., 14), ed. C.R. Whittaker, Cambridge 1988, 87–119.

Jameson 1991 M.H. Jameson, 'Sacrifice before battle', in *Hoplites: the Classical Greek battle experience*, ed. V.D. Hanson, London & New York 1991, 197–227. Jameson 1994a M.H. Jameson, 'Theoxenia', in *Epigraphical evidence*, 35–57.

Jameson 1994b M.H. Jameson, 'The ritual of the Nike parapet', in *Ritual, finance, politics*, 307–324.

Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky 1993 M.H. Jameson, D.R. Jordan & R.D. Kotansky, *A lex sacra from Selinous* (GRBM, 11). Durham 1993.

Jeffery 1990 L.H. Jeffery, *The local scripts of Archaic Greece. A study of the origin of the Greek alphabet and its development from the eighth to the fifth centuries BC* (Oxford monographs on Classical archaeology). Rev. ed. Oxford 1990.

Jenkins 1972 G.K. Jenkins, *Ancient Greek coins*. London 1972.

Jeppesen 1987 K. Jeppesen, *The theory of the alternative Erechtheion. Premises, definition, and implications* (Acta Jutlandica, 63:1, Humanities series, 60). Århus 1987.

Johnston 1997 S.I. Johnston, 'Corinthian Medea and the cult of Hera Akraia', in *Medea. Essays on Medea in myth, literature, philosophy, and art*, eds. J.J. Claus & S.I. Johnston, Princeton 1997, 44–70.

Johnston 1999 S.I. Johnston, *Restless dead. Encounters between the living and the dead in ancient Greece*. Berkeley 1999.

Jones 1974 C.P. Jones, 'Diodoros Paspáros and the Nikephoria of Pergamon', *Chiron* 4, 1974, 183–205.

Jones & Wilson 1969 *Prolegomena de comoedia. Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes. Scholia vetera in Aristophanis Equites. Scholia tricliniana in Aristophanis Equites* (Scholia in Aristophanem, 1:2), ed. D.M. Jones & N.G. Wilson. Groningen 1969.

Jordan 1985 D.R. Jordan, 'A survey of Greek defixiones not included in the special corpora', *GRBS* 26, 1985, 151–197.

Jouan 1981 F. Jouan, 'L'évocation des morts dans la tragédie grecque', *RHR* 198, 1981, 403–421.

Jouan 2000 F. Jouan, 'Héros tragique et *deus ex machina* dans deux pièces perdues d'Euripide', in *Héros et héroïnes*, 29–39.

Jouanna 1992 J. Jouanna, 'Libations et sacrifices dans la tragédie grecque', *REG* 105, 1992, 406–434.

Judeich 1931 W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen* (HdA, 3:2:2). Munich 1931.

Kadletz 1981 E. Kadletz, 'The tongues of Greek sacrificial victims', *HThR* 74, 1981, 21–29.

Kadletz 1984 E. Kadletz, 'The sacrifice of Eumaios the pig herder', *GRBS* 25, 1984, 99–105.

Kaibel 1878 G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*. Berlin 1878.

Kambitsis 1972 *L'Antiope d'Euripide. Édition commentée des fragments*, ed. J. Kambitsis. Athens 1972.

Kamps 1937 W. Kamps, 'Les origines de la fondation culturelle dans la Grèce ancienne', *Archives d'histoire du droit oriental* 1937, 145–179.

Kearns 1989 E. Kearns, *The heroes of Attica* (BICS suppl., 57). London 1989.

Kearns 1992 E. Kearns, 'Between god and man: status and function of heroes and their sanctuaries', in *Le sanctuaire grec* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 37), ed. A. Schachter & J. Bingen, Geneva 1992, 64–99 (discussion 100–107).

Kearns 1994 E. Kearns, 'Cakes in Greek sacrifice regulations', in *Epigraphical evidence*, 65–70.

Keramopoulos 1929 A.D. Κεραμοπούλλος, 'Υπὸ τὰ Προπύλαια τῆς Ἀιροπόλεως', *ArchDelt* 12, 1929, A, 86–92.

Keydell 1942 R. Keydell, 'Orphische Dichtung', *RE* 18:2 (1942), 1321–1341.

Kienast 1970 D. Kienast, 'Diodoros Paspáros', *RE* 12 (1970), 224–232.

King 1987 H. King, 'Sacrificial blood: the role of the *amnion* in ancient gynaecology', in *Rescuing Creusa. New methodological approaches to women in antiquity* (Helios, special issue, 13:2), Lubbock 1987, 117–126.

Kirk 1981 G.S. Kirk, 'Some methodological pitfalls in the study of ancient Greek sacrifice (in particular)', in *Sacrifice dans l'antiquité*, 41–80 (discussion 81–90).

Kirk 1985 G.S. Kirk, *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. 1: Books 1–4. Cambridge 1985.

Klostermann & Hansen 1991 *Eusebius Werke, vierter Band. Gegen Marcell. Über die kirchliche Theologie. Die Fragmente Marcell's*³ (Die griechischen

christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte), eds. E. Klostermann & G.Ch. Hansen. Berlin 1991.

Knigge 1974 U. Knigge, 'Die Ausgrabungen im Kerameikos 1970-72', *AA* 1974, 181-194.

Knoepfler 1986 D. Knoepfler, 'Un document attique à reconsidérer : le décret de Pandios sur l'Amphiaraion d'Oropos', *Chiron* 16, 1986, 71-98.

Knoepfler 1992 D. Knoepfler, 'Sept années de recherches sur l'épigraphie de la Béotie', *Chiron* 22, 1992, 411-503.

Kock 1888 *Comicorum atticorum fragmenta*, vol. 3, ed. T. Kock. Leipzig 1888.

Kokolakis 1995 M. Kokolakis, 'Zeus' tomb. An object of pride and reproach', *Kernos* 8, 1995, 123-138.

Kolb 1981 F. Kolb, *Agora und Theater, Volks- und Festversammlung* (Archäologische Forschungen, 9). Berlin 1981.

Kontoleon 1970 N.M. Kontoleon, *Aspects de la Grèce préclassique* (Collège de France). Paris 1970.

Körte 1893 A. Körte, 'Bezirk eines Heilgottes', *AM* 18, 1893, 231-256.

Körte 1896 A. Körte, 'Die Ausgrabungen am Westabhange der Akropolis 4. Das Heiligtum des Amynos', *AM* 21, 1896, 287-332.

Körte 1900 A. Körte, 'Der Pindarcommentator Chrysippos', *RhM* 55, 1900, 131-138.

Koster 1962 Jo. Tzetzae *commentarii in Aristophanem. Commentarium in Ranas et in Aves, argumentum Equitum* (Scholia in Aristophanem, vol. 4:3), ed. W.J.W. Koster. Groningen 1962.

Kostomitsopoulos 1988 P. Kostomitsopoulos, 'Lindian sacrifice; an evaluation of the evidence based on new inscriptions', in *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, eds. S. Dietz & I. Papachristodoulou, Copenhagen 1988, 121-128.

Kourouniotes 1936 K. Kourouniotes, *Eleusis. A guide to the excavations and the museum* (The archaeological society at Athens. Ancient sites and museums of Greece, 2). Athens 1936.

Kramer et al. 1980 *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln)*, vol. 3 (Papyrologica coloniensia, 7), ed. B. Kramer et al. Opladen 1980.

Krauss 1980 *Die Inschriften von Sestos und der thrakischen Chersones* (IK, 19), ed. J. Krauss. Bonn 1980.

Kron 1976 U. Kron, *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen. Geschichte, Mythos, Kult und Darstellungen* (AM Beih., 5). Berlin 1976.

Krummen 1990 E. Krummen, *Pysos Hymnon. Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation* (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3) (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, 35). Berlin & New York 1990.

Kübler 1973 K. Kübler, 'Eine archaische Grabanlage vor dem heiligen Tor und ihre Deutung', *AA* 1973, 172–193.

Kuhn 1985 G. Kuhn, 'Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Säulenhalle in archaischer und klassischer Zeit', *Jdl* 100, 1985, 169–317.

Kühn & Fleischer 1989 J.-H. Kühn & U. Fleischer, *Index hippocraticus*. Göttingen 1989.

Kuiper 1940 W.E.J. Kuiper, *The Greek Aulularia. A study of Plautus' masterpiece* (Mnemosyne suppl., 2). Leiden 1940.

Kunst 1927 K. Kunst, 'Lykourgos 10', *RE* 13:2 (1927), 2446–2465.

Kurtz & Boardman 1971 D.C. Kurtz & J. Boardman, *Greek burial customs* (Aspects of Greek and Roman life). London 1971.

Kutsch 1913 F. Kutsch, *Attische Heilgötter und Heilheroen* (RGVV, 12:3). Giessen 1913.

Kyrieleis 1990 H. Kyrieleis, 'Neue Ausgrabungen in Olympia', *AntW* 21, 1990, 177–188.

Kyrieleis 1992 H. Kyrieleis, 'Neue Ausgrabungen in Olympia', in *Proceedings of an international symposium on the Olympic games, 5–9 September 1988*, eds. W. Coulson & H. Kyrieleis, Athens 1992, 19–24.

Lacore 1995–96 M. Lacore, 'Mort et divinisation des filles du roi d'Athènes dans l'*Érechthée* d'Euripide', *Kentron* 11–12, 1995–96, 89–107.

Lacroix 1965 L. Lacroix, *Monnaies et colonisation dans l'occident grec* (Académie royale de Belgique. Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques. Mémoires, 8°, 58:2). Brussels 1965.

Lacroix 1988 L. Lacroix, 'Quelques exemples de disparitions miraculeuses dans les traditions de la Grèce ancienne', in *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque* (Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne, 79), eds. M.-M. Mactoux & E. Geny, Paris 1988, 183–198.

Laks & Most 1997 A. Laks & G.W. Most, 'A provisional translation of the Derveni papyrus', in *Studies on the Derveni papyrus*, eds. A. Laks &

G.W. Most, Oxford 1997, 9–22.

Lalonde 1980 G.V. Lalonde, 'A hero shrine in the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* 49 1980, 97–105.

Lambert M. 1993 M. Lambert, 'Ancient Greek and Zulu sacrificial ritual. A comparative analysis', *Numen* 40, 1993, 293–311.

Lambert S. 1997 S.D. Lambert, 'The Attic genos of the Salaminioi and the island of Salamis', *ZPE* 119, 1997, 85–106.

Lanciers 1993 E. Lanciers, 'Die Opfer im hellenistischen Herrscherkult und ihre Rezeption bei der einheimischen Bevölkerung der hellenistischen Reiche', in *Ritual and sacrifice*, 203–223.

Lane Fox 1987 R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians*. New York 1987.

Laqueur 1935 R. Laqueur, 'Neanthes', *RE* 16:2 (1935), 2108–2110.

Larson 1995 J. Larson, *Greek heroine cults* (Wisconsin studies in classics). Madison 1995.

Latte 1953–66 *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, vols. 1–2, ed. K. Latte. Copenhagen 1953–66.

Latte 1960 K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (HdA, 5:4). München 1960. Lattimore 1962 R.

Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs*. Oxford 1962. Launey 1937 M. Launey, 'Le verger d'Héraclès à Thasos', *BCH* 41, 1937, 380–409.

Laum 1914 B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*, vols. 1–2. Leipzig 1914.

Leach 1976 E. Leach, *Culture and communication: the logic by which symbols are connected. An introduction to the use of structuralist analysis in social anthropology* (Themes in the social sciences). Cambridge 1976.

Lehrs 1875 K. Lehrs, *Populäre Aufsätze aus dem Altertum vorzugsweise zur Ethik und Religion der Griechen*². Leipzig 1875.

Leonardos 1917 B. Λεονάρδος, 'Ἀμφιαρείου ἐπιγραφαί', *ArchEph* 1917, 39–48.

Lévêque & Verbanck-Piérard 1992 P. Lévêque & A. Verbanck-Piérard, 'Héraclès héros ou dieu ?', in *Héraclès. D'une rive à l'autre de la Méditerranée. Bilan et perspectives. Actes de la table ronde de Rome, Academia Belgica-École française de Rome, 15–16 septembre 1989 à l'occasion du cinquantenaire de l'Academia Belgica, en hommage à Franz Cumont, son*

premier président (Institut historique belge de Rome. Études de philologie, d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne, 28), eds. C. Bonnet & C. Jourdain-Annequin, Brussels & Rome 1992, 43–65.

Levy 1978 H. Levy, *Chaldean oracles and theurgy. Mysticism, magic and platonism in the later Roman Empire*². Paris 1978.

Lewis 1979 D.M. Lewis, 'An inventory in the Agora', *ZPE* 36, 1979, 131–134.

Lewis 1985 D.M. Lewis, 'A new Athenian decree', *ZPE* 60, 1985, 108. *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vols. 1–6, ed. W.H. Roscher. Leipzig 1884–1937.

LGS Leges graecorum sacrae e titulis collectae, vols. 1–2, eds. I. de Prott & L. Ziehen. Leipzig 1896–1906.

Liegle 1936 J. Liegle, 'Architekturbilder auf antiken Münzen', *Die Antike* 12, 1936, 202–228.

Lienhardt 1961 G. Lienhardt, *Divinity and experience. The religion of the Dinka*. Oxford 1961.

Linders 1972 T. Linders, *Studies in the treasure records of Artemis Brauronia found in Athens* (ActaAth-4°, 19). Stockholm 1972.

Linders 1994 T. Linders, 'Sacred menus on Delos', in *Epigraphical evidence*, 71–79. Littré 1839–61 *Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate. Traduction nouvelle avec le texte grec en regard*, vols. 1–10, ed. É. Littré. Paris 1839–61.

Loraux 1986 N. Loraux, *The invention of Athens. The funeral oration in the Classical city*. Cambridge, Mass. & London 1986. (Transl. by A. Sheridan of *L'invention d'Athènes. Histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la « cité classique »*. Paris 1981.)

LS F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 18). Paris 1969.

LSA F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 9). Paris 1955.

LSS F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément* (École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 11). Paris 1962.

Lust 1993 J. Lust, 'Cult and sacrifice in Daniel. The Tamid and the Abomination of Desolation', in *Ritual and sacrifice*, 283–299.

Lyons 1996 C.L. Lyons, *The Archaic cemeteries* (Morgantina studies, 5). Princeton 1996.

Malkin 1987 I. Malkin, *Religion and colonization in ancient Greece* (Studies in Greek and Roman religion, 3). Leiden 1987.

Malkin 1994 I. Malkin, *Myth and territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*. Cambridge 1994.

Malkin 1998 I. Malkin, *The returns of Odysseus. Colonization and ethnicity* (The Joan Palevsky imprint in classical literature). Berkeley 1998.

Mallwitz 1972 A. Mallwitz, *Olympia und seine Bauten*. München 1972.

Mallwitz 1988 A. Mallwitz, 'Cult and competition locations at Olympia', in *The archaeology of the Olympics: the Olympics and other festivals in antiquity* (Wisconsin studies in classics), ed. W.J. Raschke, Wisconsin 1988, 79–109.

Mansel 1957 A.M. Mansel, 'İstanbul Tersanesinde bulunan bir lâhit ve bir İstanbul lâhitler grubu hakkında araştırmalar', *Belleten* 21 (83), 1957, 395–420. (German summary: Untersuchungen über einen Sarkophag aus dem Arsenal von Istanbul und über eine Sarkophaggruppe, 421–427.)

Marchenay 1976 Ph. Marchenay, 'Le porc en Dombes (Ain). Élevage, sacrifice et charcuterie', *Ethnozootechnie* 16, 1976, 116–125.

Marinatos 1986 N. Marinatos, *Minoan sacrificial ritual. Cult practice and symbolism* (ActaAth-80, 9). Stockholm 1986.

Massa Positano 1963 *Demetrii Triclinii in Aeschlyli Persas scholia*² (Collana di studi greci, 13), ed. L. Massa Positano. Naples 1963.

Mazarakis Ainian 1997 A. Mazarakis Ainian, *From rulers' dwellings to temples. Architecture, religion and society in Early Iron Age Greece (1100–700 BC)* (SIMA, 121). Jonsered 1997.

Mazarakis Ainian 1999 A. Mazarakis Ainian, 'Reflections on hero cults in Early Iron Age Greece', in *Ancient Greek hero cult*, 9–36.

McCauley 1999 B. McCauley, 'Heroes and power: the politics of bone transferal', in *Ancient Greek hero cult*, 85–98.

McGlew 1989 J.F. McGlew, 'Royal power and the Achaean assembly at *Iliad* 2.84–393', *ClAnt* 8, 1989, 283–295.

McInerney 1994 J. McInerney, 'Politicizing the past: the *Atthis* of Kleidemos', *ClAnt* 13, 1994, 17–37.

McNamee 1995 K. McNamee, 'Missing links in the development of scholia', GRBS 36, 1995, 399–414.

Méautis 1940 G. Méautis, *L'Œdipe à Colone et le culte des héros* (Université de Neuchâtel. Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté des Lettres, 19). Neuchâtel 1940.

Meiggs & Lewis 1988 *A selection of Greek historical inscriptions to the end of the fifth century BC²*, eds. R. Meiggs & D. Lewis. Oxford 1988.

Meinecke 1849 *Stephan von Byzanz. Ethnika*, ed. A. Meinecke. Berlin 1849.

Meriç *et al.* 1981 *Die Inschriften von Ephesos 7:2 (IK, 17:2)*, eds. R. Meriç *et al.* Bonn 1981.

Meritt 1931 B.D. Meritt, *Corinth VIII:1. Greek inscriptions: 1896–1927*. Princeton 1931.

Meritt 1942 B.D. Meritt, 'Greek inscriptions', *Hesperia* 11, 1942, 275–303.

Meuli 1946 K. Meuli, 'Griechische Opferbräuche', in *Phyllobolia für Peter von der Mühl zum 60. Geburtstag am 1. August 1945*, Basel 1946, 185–288.

Migeotte 1985 L. Migeotte, 'Réparation de monuments publics à Messène au temps d'Auguste', *BCH* 109, 1985, 597–607.

Mikalson 1975a J.D. Mikalson, *The sacred and civil calendar of the Athenian year*. Princeton 1975.

Mikalson 1975b J.D. Mikalson, 'Ἡμέρα ἀποφράς', *AJP* 96, 1975, 19–27.

Mikalson 1976 J.D. Mikalson, 'Erechtheus and the Panathenaia', *AJPh* 97, 1976, 141–153.

Mikalson 1977 J.D. Mikalson, 'Religion in the Attic demes', *AJP* 98, 1977, 424–435.

Mikalson 1982 J.D. Mikalson, 'The heart of heartology', *GRBS* 23, 1982, 213–221.

Mikalson 1983 J.D. Mikalson, *Athenian popular religion*. Chapel Hill & London 1983.

Mikalson 1991 J.D. Mikalson, *Honor thy gods. Popular religion in Greek tragedy*. Chapel Hill & London 1991.

Mikalson 1998 J.D. Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens* (Hellenistic culture and society, 29). Berkeley 1998.

Milgrom 1991 J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: a new translation with introduction and commentary* (The Anchor Bible). New York 1991.

Miller 1978 S.G. Miller, *The prytaneion. Its function and architectural form*. Berkeley 1978.

Mitsos 1967 M. Θ. Μιτσός, 'Ἐπιγραφικὰ ἐξ Ἀσκληπιδείου Ἐπιδαύρου Ι', *ArchEph* 1967, 1-28.

Morris 1989 I. Morris, 'Attitudes toward death in Archaic Greece', *ClAnt* 8, 1989, 296-320.

Morris 1992 I. Morris, *Death-ritual and social structure in Classical antiquity* (Key themes in ancient history). Cambridge 1992.

Motte 2000 A. Motte, 'La catégorie platonicienne du héros', in *Héros et héros* "nes, 79-90.

Müller 1848 K.O. Müller, 'Eleusinien', in *Kleine Deutsche Schriften über Religion, Kunst, Sprache und Literatur, Leben und Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. 2, Breslau 1848, 242-311.

Murray 1988 O. Murray, 'Death and the symposion', in *La parola, l'immagine, la tomba. Atti del colloquio internazionale di Capri. AION ArchStAnt* 10, 1988, 239-257.

Murray 1990 O. Murray, 'Sympotic history', in *Sympotica*, 3-13.

Mylonas 1961 G.E. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian mysteries*. Princeton 1961.

Nägelsbach 1857 K.F. Nägelsbach, *Die nachhomerische Theologie des griechischen Volksglaubens bis auf Alexander*. Nürnberg 1857.

Nagy 1979 G. Nagy, *The best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the hero in Archaic Greek poetry*. Baltimore 1979.

Nauck 1889 *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta*, ed. A. Nauck. Leipzig 1889.

Németh 1994 G. Németh, 'ΜΕΔ _ ὄνθον ἐγβαλεν. Regulations concerning everyday life in a Greek temenos' in *Epigraphical evidence*, 59-64.

Nickau 1966 *Amonii qui dicitur liber De adfinium vocabulorum differentia* (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. K. Nickau. Leipzig 1966.

Nilsson 1906 M.P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der attischen*. Leipzig 1906.

Nilsson 1922 M.P. Nilsson, 'Der Flammentod des Herakles auf dem Oite', *ArchRW* 21, 1922, 310–316.

Nilsson 1923 M.P. Nilsson, 'Fire-festivals in ancient Greece', *JHS* 43, 1923, 144–148.

Nilsson 1950 M.P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, vol. 2. *Die hellenistische und römische Zeit* (HdA, 5:2:2). Munich 1950.

Nilsson 1951 M.P. Nilsson, 'Die Prozessionstypen im griechischen Kult. Mit einem Anhang über die dionysischen Prozessionen in Athen', *Opuscula Selecta* 1, 1951, 166–214.

Nilsson 1955 M.P. Nilsson, *Die hellenistische Schule*. Munich 1955.

Nilsson 1967 M.P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, vol. 1. *Die Religion Griechenlands bis auf die griechische Weltherrschaft* 3 (HdA, 5:2:1). Munich 1967.

Nock 1944 A.D. Nock, 'The cult of heroes', *HTThR* 37, 1944, 141–174 = *Essays on religion and the ancient world. Selected and edited, with an introduction, bibliography of Nock's writings, and indexes*, vols. 1–2, ed. Z. Stewart, Oxford 1972, 575–602.

Nock 1950 A.D. Nock, 'Tertullian and the *ahori*', *Vigiliae Christianae* 4, 1950, 129–141 = *Essays on religion and the ancient world. Selected and edited, with an introduction, bibliography of Nock's writings, and indexes*, vols. 1–2, ed. Z. Stewart, Oxford 1972, 712–719.

North 1996 J.A. North, 'Pollution and purification at Selinous', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 15, 1996, 293–301.

Nowak 1960 H. Nowak, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Begriffes Daimon: eine Untersuchung epigraphischer Zeugnisse vom 5. Jh.v.Chr. bis zum 5. Jh.n.Chr.* Inaug. diss. Bonn 1960.

Ohnesorg 1991 A. Ohnesorg, 'Altäre auf Paros', in *L'espace sacrificiel*, 121–126 (discussion 316).

Oliver 1935 J.H. Oliver, 'Greek inscriptions', *Hesperia* 4, 1935, 5–107.
Olympian and chthonian Greek sacrificial ritual, Olympian and chthonian. Proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on ancient Greek cult, organized by the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, Göteborg university, 25–27 April 1997 (Acta-Ath-80), ed. R. Hägg, forthcoming.

Orlandos 1959 A.K. Ὀρλάνδος, 'Ἀνασκαφὴ Μεσσήνης', *Prakt* 1959

(1965), 162–173.

Orlandos 1968 A. Orlandos, *Les matériaux de construction et la technique architecturale des anciens grecs*, vol. 2 (École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 16:2). Paris 1968.

Page 1955 D. Page, *The Homeric Odyssey. The Mary Flexner lectures delivered at Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania*. Oxford 1955.

Page 1962 *Poetae Melici Graeci. Alcmanis, Stesichori, Ibyci, Anacreontis, Simonidis, Corinnae, Poetarum minorum reliquias, Carmina popularia et convivalia quaeque adespota feruntur*, ed. D.L. Page. Oxford 1962.

Page 1981 *Further Greek epigrams. Epigrams before A.D. 50 from the Greek anthology and other sources, not included in "Hellenistic epigrams" or "The Garland of Philip"*, ed. D.L. Page. Cambridge 1981.

Pantos 1990 Π. Πάντος, 'Οίτη. Πυρά', *Ηρακλέους* *ArchDelt* 45, 1990, B, 174.

Papageorgius 1888 *Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias vetera* (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. P.N. Papageorgius. Leipzig 1888.

Pappadakis 1919 N.G.Pappadáki, '>Anaskafätäv "Purâv" tävO³thv', *ArchDelt* 5, 1919, B, 25–34.

Pariente 1992 A. Pariente, 'Le monument argien des « Sept contre Thèbes »', in *Polydipsion Argos. Argos de la fin des palais mycéniens à la constitution de l'État classique*. Fribourg (Suisse), 7–9 mai 1987 (BCH suppl., 22), ed. M. Piérart, Paris 1992, 195–225.

Parisi Presicce 1991 C. Parisi Presicce, 'Cirene : gli altari del santuario di Apollo', in *L'espace sacrificiel*, 159–165.

Parke 1967 H.W. Parke, *The oracles of Zeus. Dodona. Olympia. Ammon*. Oxford 1967.

Parke 1977 H.W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (Aspects of Greek and Roman life). London 1977.

Parke 1985 H.W. Parke, *The oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*. London 1985.

Parker 1983 R. Parker, *Miasma. Pollution and purification in early Greek religion*. Oxford 1983.

Parker 1984 R. Parker, 'The Herakleidai at Thorikos', *ZPE* 57, 1984, 59.

Parker 1987 R. Parker, 'Festivals of the Attic demes', in *Gifts to the gods*, 137–147.

Parker 1988 R. Parker, 'Were Spartan kings heroized?', *LCM* 13.1, 1988, 9–10.

Parker 1996 R. Parker, *Athenian religion. A history*. Oxford 1996.

Parker (forthcoming) R. Parker, 'ὥς ἥρωι ἐναγίζειν', in *Olympian and chthonian*, forthcoming.

Patillon & Segonds 1995 *Porphyre. De l'abstinence*, vol. 3:4. *Texte établi, traduit et annoté* (Collection des universités de France), ed. M. Patillon & A.Ph. Segonds. Paris 1995.

Paton 1927 *The Erechtheum*, ed. J.M. Paton. Cambridge, Mass. 1927.

Paton & Hicks 1891 W.R. Paton & E.L. Hicks, *The inscriptions of Cos*. Oxford 1891.

PCG *Poetae comici graeci* (PCG), vols. 1–8, eds. R. Kassel & C. Austin. Berlin & New York 1984–95.

Peek 1969 W. Peek, *Inschriften aus den Asklepieion von Epidauros* (AbhLeip, 60:2). Berlin 1969.

Peirce 1993 S. Peirce, 'Death, revelry, and *thysia*', *ClAnt* 12, 1993, 219–266.

Pélékidis 1962 C. Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 13). Paris 1962.

Peppas- Delmousou 1988 D. Peppas-Delmousou, 'Autour des inventaires de Brauron', in *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux* (Université de Neuchâtel. Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté des Lettres, 40), eds. D. Knoepfler & N. Quellet, Neuchâtel & Genève 1988, 323–346.

Perdrizet 1898 P. Perdrizet, 'Inscriptions d'Acraephiae', *BCH* 22, 1898, 241–260.

Perret 1942 J. Perret, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (281–31)* (Collection d'études anciennes). Paris 1942.

Perry 1952 *Aesopica. A series of texts relating to Aesop or ascribed to him or closely connected with the literary tradition that bears his name. Collected and critically edited, in part translated from Oriental languages, with a commentary and historical essay*, vol. 1. *Greek and Latin texts*, ed. B.E. Perry. Urbana 1952.

Petrakos 1968 Β.Χ. Πετράκιος, 'Ὀρωπὸς καὶ τὸ ἱερόν, τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 63). Athens 1968.

Petrakos 1991 Β.Χ. Πετράκιος, Ἀνασκαφὴ Ραμνοῦντος', *Prakt* 1991 (1994), 1–63.

Petropoulou 1981 Α. Petropoulou, 'The *eparche* documents and the early oracle at Oropus', *GRBS* 22, 1981, 39–63.

Petropoulou 1985 Α. Petropoulou, 'Pausanias 1.34.5: incubation on a ram skin', in *La Béotie antique. Lyon-Saint-Étienne 16–20 mai 1983*, Paris 1985, 169–177.

Petropoulou 1987 Α. Petropoulou, 'The sacrifice of Eumaeus reconsidered', *GRBS* 28, 1987, 135–149.

Petropoulou 1991 Α. Petropoulou, 'Prothysis and altar: a case study', in *L'espace sacrificiel*, 25–31.

Petzl 1969 G. Petzl, *Antike Diskussionen über die beiden Nekyiai* (Beträge zur klassischen Philologie, 29). Meisenheim am Glan 1969.

Petzl 1987 *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*, vol. 2:1 (IK, 24:1), ed. G. Petzl. Bonn 1987.

Pfister 1909–12 F. Pfister, *Die Reliquienkult im Altertum*, vols. 1–2 (RGVV, 5:1–2). Giessen 1909–12.

Pfuhl 1903 E. Pfuhl, 'Die archaische Friedhof am Stadtberge von Thera', *AM* 28, 1903, 1–288.

Picard 1923 Ch. Picard, 'Un rituel archaïque du culte de l'Héraclès thasien trouvé à Thasos', *BCH* 47, 1923, 241–274.

Picard 1946 Ch. Picard, 'L'architecture hellénique et hellénistique à Délos', *JSav* 131, 1946, 49–66.

Picard & Replat 1924 Ch. Picard & J. Replat, 'Recherches sur la topographie du hiéron délien', *BCH* 48, 1924, 217–263.

Pickard-Cambridge 1968 A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The dramatic festivals of Athens*². Oxford 1968.

Piérart 1998 M. Piérart, 'Panthéon et hellénisation dans la colonie romaine de Corinthe : la « redécouverte » du culte de Palaimon à Isthme', in *Actes du VI^e colloque international du C.I.E.R.G.A. « Les panthéons des cités. Origines et développements » tenu à Liège du 15 au 17 mai 1997 (1^e partie)* (= *Kernos* 11, 1998), Athens & Liège 1998, 85–109.

Pirenne-Delforge 1996 V. Pirenne-Delforge, 'Les Charites à Athènes et dans l'île de Cos', *Kernos* 9, 1996, 195–214.

Pirenne-Delforge 2001 V. Pirenne-Delforge, 'Les rites sacrificiels dans la Périégèse de Pausanias', in *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000*, eds. D. Knoepfler & M. Piérart. Geneva 2001, 109–134.

Platvoet 1982 J.G. Platvoet, *Comparing religions: a limitative approach. An analysis of Akan, Para-Creole, and IFO-Sananda rites and prayers* (Religion and reason, 24). The Hague 1982.

Podlecki 1975 A.J. Podlecki, *The life of Themistocles. A critical survey of the literary and archaeological evidence*. Montreal & London 1975.

de Polignac 1995 F. de Polignac, *Cults, territory and the origins of the Greek city-state*. Chicago & London 1995.

Pollitt 1961 J.J. Pollitt, 'Fragment of a sacred calendar and other inscriptions from the Attic deme of Teithras', *Hesperia* 30, 1961, 293–298.

Pomtow 1883 H.R. Pomtow, 'Die Orakelinschriften von Dodona', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 53, 1883, 305–360.

Popham 1993 M.R. Popham, 'The sequence of events and conclusion', in *Lefkandi II. The Protogeometric building at Toumba*, vol. 2. *The excavation, architecture and finds*, eds. M.R. Popham, P.G. Calligas & L.H. Sackett, Athens 1993, 97–101.

Pötscher 1964 *Theophrastos. Περὶ εὐσεβείας* (Philosophia antiqua, 11), ed. W. Pötscher. Leiden 1964.

Pouilloux 1954a J. Pouilloux, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte (Étude de topographie et d'histoire)* (BEFAR, 179). Paris 1954.

Pouilloux 1954b J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, vol. 1. *De la fondation de la cité à 196 avant J.-C.* (Études thasiennes, 3). Paris 1954.

Pouilloux 1994 J. Pouilloux, 'Théogénès de Thasos ... quarante ans après', *BCH* 118, 1994, 199–206.

Pouilloux & Roux 1963 J. Pouilloux & G. Roux, *Énigmes à Delphes*. Paris 1963.

Powell B. 1989 B.B. Powell, 'Why was the Greek alphabet invented? The epigraphical evidence', *ClAnt* 8, 1989, 321–350.

Powell J. 1966 J.E. Powell, *A lexicon to Herodotus*² (Olms paperbacks, 26).

Hildesheim 1966.

Price 1984a S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge 1984.

Price 1984b S.R.F. Price, 'Gods and emperors: the Greek language of the Roman imperial cult', *JHS* 104, 1984, 79–95.

Pritchett 1953 W.K. Pritchett, 'The Attic stelai, part I', *Hesperia* 22, 1953, 225–299.

Pritchett 1979 W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek state at war*, vol. 3. Religion. Berkeley 1979.

von Prott 1899 H. von Prott, 'Ein ἱερὸς νόμος der Eleusinien', *AM* 24, 1899, 241–266.

Rabe 1906 *Scholia in Lucianum*, ed. H. Rabe. Leipzig 1906.

Race 1997 *Pindar* (Loeb classical library), vols. 1–2, ed. and transl. W.H. Race. Cambridge, Mass. & London 1997.

Radermacher 1951 *Artium scriptores (Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik)* (SBWien, 227:3), ed. L. Radermacher. Wien 1951.

Radke 1936 G. Radke, *Die Bedeutung der weissen und der schwartzen Farbe in Kult und Brauch der Griechen und Römer*. Inaug. diss. Jena 1936.

Radt 1977 *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta*, vol. 4. *Sophocles*, ed. S. Radt. Göttingen 1977.

Raepsaet 1984 G. Raepsaet, 'Transport de tambours de colonnes du Pentélique à Éleusis au iv^e siècle avant notre ère', *AntCl* 53, 1984, 101–136.

Ramos Jurado 2000 E.A. Ramos Jurado, 'L'intégration de la classe des héros dans la pensée grecque de l'antiquité tardive', in *Héros et héros"nes*, 101–110.

Ratinaud-Lachkar 1999 I. Ratinaud-Lachkar, 'Les Argiens et leurs ancêtres. À propos des objets d'époque géométrique trouvés dans quelques tombes mycénienes', in *Le Péloponnèse. Archéologie et histoire (Histoire)*, ed. J. Renard, Rennes 1999, 87–108.

Rattenbury, Lumb & Maillon 1960 *Héliodore. Les Éthiopiennes (Théagène et Chariclée)* (Collection des Universités de France), vol. 2, eds. R.M. Rattenbury, T.W. Lumb & J. Maillon. Paris 1960.

Raven 1957 E.J.P. Raven, 'The Leucaspis type at Syracuse', in *Congrès international de numismatique, Paris, 6–11 juillet 1953*, vol. 2, eds. J.

Babelon & J. Lafaurie, Paris 1957, 77–81.

Reinmuth 1955 O.W. Reinmuth, 'The ephebic inscription, Athenian Agora I 286', *Hesperia* 24, 1955, 220–239.

Reisch 1907 E. Reisch, 'Eschara', *RE* 6:1 (1907), 614–617.

Reverdin 1945 O. Reverdin, *La religion de la cité platonicienne* (École française d'Athènes. Travaux et mémoires, 6). Paris 1945.

RGVV *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*

Rhodes 1981 P.J. Rhodes, *A commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford 1981.

Rhousopoulos 1862 A.S. 'Ρουσόπουλος, 'Επιγραφαὶ ἑλληνικαί', *ArchEph* 1862, 82–83. Rhousopoulos 1896 A. Rhousopoulos, 'Das Monument des Themistokles in Magnesia', *AM* 21, 1896, 18–26.

Rice 1983 E.E. Rice, *The grand procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxford classical and philosophical monographs). Oxford 1983.

Richardson 1993 N. Richardson, *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. 6. Books 21–24. Cambridge 1993.

Ridgeway 1912 W. Ridgeway, 'The origin of tragedy: a reply', *CR* 26, 1912, 134–139.

Riethmüller 1996 J.W. Riethmüller, 'Die Tholos und das Ei. Zur Deutung der Thymele von Epidauros', *Nikephoros* 9, 1996, 71–109.

Riethmüller 1999 J.W. Riethmüller, 'Bothros und tertastyle: the heroon of Asclepius in Athens', in *Ancient Greek hero cult*, 123–143.

Ringgren 1982 H. Ringgren, *Israelitische Religion* 2 (Die Religionen der Menschheit, 26). Stuttgart 1982.

Ritual and sacrifice Ritual and sacrifice in the ancient Near East: proceedings of the International Conference organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of April 1991 (Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta, 55), ed. J. Quaegebeur. Leuven 1993.

Ritual, finance, politics Ritual, finance, politics. Athenian democratic accounts presented to David Lewis, eds. R. Osborne & S. Hornblower. Oxford 1994.

Rizzo 1946 G.E. Rizzo, *Monete greche della Sicilia. Descritte e illustrate*. Rome 1946.

Robert F. 1939 F. Robert, *Thymélè. Recherches sur la signification et la destination des monuments circulaires dans l'architecture religieuse de la*

Grèce (BEFAR, 147). Paris 1939.

Robert F. 1952 F. Robert, *Exploration archéologique de Délos XX. Trois sanctuaires sur le rivage occidental. Dioscourion, Asclépiéion, sanctuaire anonyme (Leucothion?)*. Paris 1952.

Robert F. 1953 F. Robert, 'Le sanctuaire de l'archégète Anios à Délos', *RA* 41–42, 1953, 8–40.

Robert L. 1937 L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes. Recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Mineure* (Études orientales, 5). Paris 1937.

Robert L. 1939 L. Robert, 'Hellenica', *RevPhil* 65, 1939, 97–217 (= *Opera Minora Selecta. Épigraphie et antiquités grecques*, vol. 2, Amsterdam 1969, 1250–1370).

Robert J. & L. 1959–63 J. & L. Robert, 'Thrace, Mésie, côte européenne du Pont Euxin, no. 252', *BullEpigr* 4, 1959–63, 59–61.

Robert J. & L. 1964–67 J. & L. Robert, 'Péloponnèse, no. 200', *BullEpigr* 5, 1964–67, 308–311.

Robertson 1983 N. Robertson, 'Greek ritual begging in aid of women's fertility and childbirth', *TAPA* 113, 1983, 143–169.

Robertson 1985 N. Robertson, 'The origin of the Panathenaia', *RhM* 128, 1985, 231–295.

Robertson 1993 N. Robertson, 'Athens' festival of the new wine', *HSCP* 95, 1993, 197–250.

Robertson 1996 N. Robertson, 'Athena's shrines and festivals', in *Worshipping Athena. Panathenaia and Parthenon* (Wisconsin studies in classics), ed. J. Neils, Madison 1996, 27–77.

Robinson 1976 H.S. Robinson, 'Excavations at Corinth: Temple Hill, 1968–1972', *Hesperia* 45, 1976, 203–239.

Rodríguez Moreno 2000 I. Rodríguez Moreno, 'Le héros comme μετὰξὺ entre l'homme et la divinité dans la pensée grecque', in *Héros et héros* nes, 91–100.

Rohde 1925 E. Rohde, *Psyche. The cult of souls and belief in immortality among the ancient Greeks*⁸. London & New York 1925. (Transl. by W.B. Hillis of *Psyche. Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*². Freiburg 1898).

Role of religion in the early Greek polis The role of religion in the early Greek polis. Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on ancient Greek cult,

organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16–18 October 1992 (ActaAth-8°, 14), ed. R. Hägg. Stockholm 1996.

Roller 1981 L.E. Roller, 'Funeral games for historical persons', *Stadion* 7, 1981, 1–18.

Rose 1953 H.J. Rose, 'The degradation of heroes', in *Studies presented to D.M. Robinson on his seventieth birthday*, vol. 2, eds. G.E. Mylonas & D. Raymond, Saint Louis 1953, 1052–1057.

Rosivach 1994 V.J. Rosivach, *The system of public sacrifice in fourth-century Athens* (American philological association. American Classical studies, 34). Atlanta 1994.

Rotroff 1978 S.I. Rotroff, 'An anonymous hero in the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* 47, 1978, 196–209.

Rougemont 1977 G. Rougemont, *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes I. Lois sacrées et règlements religieux*. Paris 1977.

Roussel 1916 P. Roussel, *Les cultes égyptiens à Délos du iii^e au i^{er} siècle av. J.-C.* (Annales de l'Est, 3^e série, 6–7, 1915–1916). Paris & Nancy 1916.

Roux 1961 G. Roux, *L'architecture de l'Argolide aux iv^e et iii^e siècles avant J.-C.* (BEFAR, 199). Paris 1961.

Roux 1973 G. Roux, 'Salles de banquets à Délos', in *Études déliennes publiées à l'occasion du centième anniversaire du début des fouilles de l'École française d'Athènes à Délos* (BCH suppl., 1), Paris 1973, 525–554.

Roux 1979 G. Roux, 'Le vrai temple d'Apollon à Délos', *BCH* 103, 1979, 109–135.

Roux 1981 G. Roux, 'Problèmes déliens', *BCH* 105, 1981, 41–78.

Rudhardt 1958 J. Rudhardt, *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique*. Paris 1958.

Rudhardt 1970 J. Rudhardt, 'Les mythes grecs relatifs à l'instauration du sacrifice : les rôles corrélatifs de Prométhée et de son fils Deucalion', *MusHel* 27, 1970, 1–15.

Rupp 1974 D.W. Rupp, *Greek altars of the northeastern Peloponnese c. 750/725 B.C. to c. 300/275 B.C.* PhD diss. Bryn Mawr College 1974.

Rupp 1979 D.W. Rupp, 'The lost Classical Palaimonion found?', *Hesperia* 48, 1979, 64–72.

Rupp 1991 D.W. Rupp, 'Blazing altars: the depiction of altars in Attic vase painting', in *L'espace sacrificiel*, 56–62.

Ruschenbusch 1966 E. Ruschenbusch, ΣΟΛΩΝΟΣ ΝΟΜΟΙ. *Die Fragmente des solonischen Gesetzeswerkes mit einer Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte* (Historia Einzelschriften, 9). Wiesbaden 1966.

Rusten 1983 J.S. Rusten, 'TEITΩN HPΩΣ: Pindar's prayer to Heracles (N. 7.86–101) and Greek popular religion', *HSCP* 87, 1983, 289–297.

Sacrifice dans l'antiquité Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 27), eds. J. Rudhardt & O. Reverdin. Geneva 1981.

Saïd 1998 S. Saïd, 'Tombes épiques d'Homère à Apollonios', in *Nécropoles et pouvoir : idéologies, pratiques et interprétations. Actes du colloque « Théories de la nécropole antique », Lyon 21–25 janvier 1995* (Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient, 27), eds. S. Marchegay, M.-Th. Le Dinahet & J.-F. Salles, Lyon 1998, 9–20.

Salapata 1993 G. Salapata, 'The Laconian hero reliefs in the light of the terracotta plaques', in *Sculpture from Arcadia and Laconia. Proceedings of an international conference held at the Athenian School of Classical Studies at Athens, April 10–14, 1992* (Oxbow monographs, 30), eds. O. Palagia & W. Coulson, Oxford 1993, 189–197.

Sale 1961 W. Sale, 'The Hyperborean maidens at Delos', *HThR* 44, 1961, 75–89.

Salviat 1958 F. Salviat, 'Une nouvelle loi thasienne : institutions judiciaires et fêtes religieuses à la fin du iv^e siècle av. J.-C.', *BCH* 82, 1958, 193–267.

Samuel 1972 A.E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman chronology. Calendars and years in classical antiquity* (HdA, 1:7). München 1972.

Sanders 1991 L.J. Sanders, 'Dionysos I of Syracuse and the origins of the ruler cults in the Greek world', *Historia* 40, 1991, 275–287.

Schachter 1981 A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, vol. 1. *Acheloos to Hera* (BICS suppl., 38:1). London 1981.

Schachter 1986 A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, vol. 2. *Herakles to Poseidon* (BICS suppl., 38:2). London 1986.

Schachter 1994 A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, vol. 3. *Potnia to Zeus. Cults of deities unspecified by name* (BICS suppl., 38:3). London 1994.

Schallin 1993 A.-L. Schallin, *Islands under influence. The Cyclades in the Late Bronze Age and the nature of Mycenaean presence* (SIMA, 111). Jonsered 1993.

Schleif 1933 H. Schleif, 'Der grosse Altar der Hera von Samos', *AM* 58, 1933, 174–210.

Schlesier 1990 R. Schlesier, 'Apopompe', in *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe*, vol. 2, eds. H. Cancik, B. Gladigow & M. Laubscher, Stuttgart 1990, 38–41.

Schlesier 1991–92 R. Schlesier, 'Olympian versus Chthonian religion', *Scripta classica israelica* 11, 1991–92, 38–51.

Schmidt B. 1994 B.B. Schmidt, *Israel's beneficent dead. Ancestor cult and necromancy in ancient Israelite religion and tradition* (Forschung zum alten Testament, 11). Tübingen 1994.

Schmidt J. 1916–24 J. Schmidt, 'Tydeides', in *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. 5, 1387–1388.

Schmidt M. 1969 M. Schmidt, 'Der Zorn des Achill, ein Stamnos des Triptolemosmalers', in *Opus nobile. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Ulf Jantzen*, ed. P. Zazoff, Wiesbaden 1969, 141–152.

Schmitt Pantel 1990 P. Schmitt Pantel, 'Sacrificial meal and symposion: two models of civic institutions in the Archaic city', in *Sympotica*, 14–33.

Schmitt Pantel 1992 P. Schmitt Pantel, *La cité au banquet. Histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques* (CEFR, 157). Rome 1992.

Schoemann 1859 G.F. Schoemann, *Griechische Alterthümer*, vol. 2. *Die internationalen Verhältnisse und das Religionswesen*. Berlin 1859.

Schröder 1904 B. Schröder, 'Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1902–1903: Die Inschriften', *AM* 29, 1904, 152–160.

Schulhof 1908 E. Schulhof, 'Fouilles de Délos. Inscriptions financières', *BCH* 32, 1908, 5–132.

Schwartz 1887 *Scholia in Euripidem*, vol. 1, ed. E. Schwartz. Berlin 1887.

Scullion 1994 S. Scullion, 'Olympian and chthonian', *ClAnt* 13, 1994, 75–119.

Scullion 1998 S. Scullion, 'Three notes on Attic sacrificial calendars', *ZPE* 121, 1998, 116–122.

Scullion 2000 S. Scullion, 'Heroic and chthonian sacrifice: new evidence from Selinous', *ZPE* 132, 2000, 163–171.

Seaford 1994 R. Seaford, *Reciprocity and ritual. Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state*. Oxford 1994.

Seiwert 1998 H. Seiwert, 'Opfer', in *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe*, vol. 4, eds. H. Cancik, B. Gladigow & K.-H. Kohl, Stuttgart 1998, 268–284.

Segre 1993 M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (Monografie della scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in Oriente, 6). Rome 1993.

Seyrig 1927 H. Seyrig, 'Quatre cultes de Thasos. II. Héraclès', *BCH* 51, 1927, 178–233.

Shapiro 1986 H.A. Shapiro, 'The Attic deity Basile', *ZPE* 63, 1986, 134–136.

Shelton (forthcoming) K.S. Shelton, 'Accidental tourist in search for the past: the significance of Iron Age finds in Bronze Age tombs?', in *Lighten our darkness: Cultural transformations at the beginning of the first millenium BC--from the Alps to Anatolia*. University of Birmingham, 6–9 Jan. 2000, forthcoming.

Sherwin-White 1977 S.M. Sherwin-White, 'Inscriptions from Cos', *ZPE* 24, 1977, 205–217.

Sherwin-White 1978 S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos. A historical study from the Dorian settlement to the Imperial period* (Hypomnemata, 51). Göttingen 1978. Sinn 1991 U. Sinn, 'Olympia. Die Stellung der Wettkämpfe im Kult des Zeus Olympios', *Nikephoros* 4, 1991, 31–54.

Sinn 1992 U. Sinn, 'Sunion. Das befestigte Heiligtum der Athena und des Poseidon an der „Heiligen Landspitze Attikas“', *AntW* 23, 1992, 175–190.

Slater 1969 *Lexicon to Pindar*, ed. W.J. Slater. Berlin 1969.

Slater 1989 W.J. Slater, 'Pelops at Olympia', *GRBS* 30, 1989, 485–501.

Smith 1976 *Scholia Graeca in Aeschylum quae extant omnia*, vol. 1. *Scholia in Agamemnonem, Choephoros, Eumenides, Supplices continens* (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. O.L. Smith. Leipzig 1976.

Smith 1981 O.L. Smith, 'Hvad er scholier og hvad kan man bruge dem til?', *Museum Tusculaneum* 44–47, 1981, 161–179.

Smith 1982 *Scholia graeca in Aeschylum quae extant omnia*, vol. 2:2. *Scholia in Septem adversus Thebas continens* (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. O.L. Smith. Leipzig 1982.

Sørensen & Pentz 1992 L.W. Sørensen & P. Pentz, *Lindos IV.2. Excavations and surveys in southern Rhodes: The post-Mycenaean period until Roman times and the Medieval period*. Berlin 1992.

Sourvinou-Inwood 1983 Ch. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'A trauma in flux: death in the 8th century and after', in *The Greek renaissance of the eighth century B.C.: tradition and innovation. Proceedings of the Second International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 1-5 June, 1981* (ActaAth-4°, 30), ed. R. Hägg, Stockholm 1983, 33-48.

Sourvinou-Inwood 1990 Ch. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'What is polis religion?', in *The Greek city from Homer to Alexander*, eds. O. Murray & S. Price, Oxford 1990, 295-322.

Sourvinou-Inwood 1991 Ch. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Reading' Greek culture. *Texts and images, rituals and myths*. Oxford 1991.

Sourvinou-Inwood 1994 Ch. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Something to do with Athens: tragedy and ritual', in *Ritual, finance, politics*, 269-290.

Sourvinou-Inwood 1995 Ch. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Reading' Greek death: *to the end of the Classical period*. Oxford 1995.

Spawforth & Walker 1985 A.J. Spawforth & S. Walker, 'The world of the Panhellenion 1. Athens and Eleusis', *JRS* 75, 1985, 78-104.

Spawforth & Walker 1986 A.J. Spawforth & S. Walker, 'The world of the Panhellenion 2. Three Dorian cities', *JRS* 76, 1986, 88-105.

Stallbaum 1825-26 *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, vols. 1-2, ed. G. Stallbaum. Leipzig 1825-26.

Stengel 1910 P. Stengel, *Opferbräuche der Griechen*. Leipzig & Berlin 1910.

Stengel 1914 P. Stengel, 'Zu den griechischen Schwuropfern', *Hermes* 49, 1914, 90-101.

Stengel 1920 P. Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*³ (HdA, 5:3). Munich 1920.

Stern 1986 E.M. Stern, 'Das Haus des Erechtheus', *Boreas* 9, 1986, 51-64.

Stoddart & Whitley 1988 S. Stoddart & J. Whitley, 'The social context of literacy in Archaic Greece and Etruria', *Antiquity* 62, 1988, 761-772.

van Straten 1974 F.T. van Straten, 'Did the Greeks kneel before their gods?', *BABesch* 49, 1974, 159-189.

van Straten 1995 F.T. van Straten, Hierà kalá. *Images of animal sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman world, 127). Leiden 1995. Stupperich 1977 R. Stupperich, *Staatsbegräbnis und Privatgrabmal im klassischen Athen*. Inaug. diss. Münster 1977.

Stupperich 1994 R. Stupperich, 'The iconography of Athenian state burials in the Classical period', in *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under the democracy. Proceedings of an international conference celebrating 2500 years since the birth of democracy in Greece, held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4-6, 1992* (Oxbow monographs, 37), ed. W.D.E. Coulson et al., Oxford 1994, 93-103.

Sturz 1818 *Etymologicum graecae linguae gudianum*, ed. F.W. Sturz. Leipzig 1818.

Suárez de la Torre 1997 E. Suárez de la Torre, 'Neoptolemos at Delphi', *Kernos* 10, 1997, 153-176.

Suppl. Hell. 1983 *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Texte und Kommentare, 11), eds. H. Lloyd-Jones & P. Parsons. Berlin & New York 1983.

Swain 1990 S.C.R. Swain, 'Hellenic culture and Roman heroes of Plutarch', *JHS* 110, 1990, 126-145.

Sympotica Sympotica. A symposium on the symposium, ed. O. Murray. Oxford 1990.

Taeger 1957 F. Taeger, *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*, vol. 1. Stuttgart 1957.

Tarlow 1997 S. Tarlow, 'An archaeology of remembering: death, bereavement and the First World War', *CAJ* 7, 1997, 105-121.

Theodoridis 1982-98 *Photii patriarchae lexicon*, vols. 1-2, ed. Ch. Theodoridis. Berlin 1982-98.

Thomas 1992 R. Thomas, *Literacy and orality in ancient Greece* (Key themes in ancient history). Cambridge 1992.

Thompson 1938 H.A. Thompson, 'Additional note on the identification of the property of the Salaminians at Sounion', *Hesperia* 7, 1938, 75-76.

Thompson 1940 H.A. Thompson, *The Tholos of Athens and its predecessors* (Hesperia suppl., 4). Athens 1940.

Thompson 1953 H.A. Thompson, 'Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1952', *Hesperia* 22, 1953, 25-56.

Thompson & Wycherley 1972 H.A. Thompson & R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora XIV. The Agora of Athens. The history, shape and uses of an ancient city center*. Princeton 1972.

Thomsen 1909 A. Thomsen, 'Der Trug des Prometheus', *ArchRW* 12, 1909, 460–490.

Thönges-Stringaris 1965 R.N. Thönges-Stringaris, 'Das griechische Totenmahl', *AM* 80, 1965, 1–99.

Thummer 1968 E. Thummer, *Pindar. Die isthmischen Gedichte. Textkritisch herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert, mit einer Analyse der pindarischen Epinikien*, vol. 1 (Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern). Heidelberg 1968.

Toher 1991 M. Toher, 'Greek funerary legislation and the two Spartan funerals', in *Georgica. Greek studies in honour of George Cawkwell* (BICS suppl., 58), eds. M.A. Flower & M. Toher, London 1991, 159–175.

Tomlinson 1990 R.A. Tomlinson, 'The chronology of the Perachora hestiatorion and its significance', in *Sympotica*, 95–101.

Tracy 1995 S.V. Tracy, *Athenian democracy in transition. Attic letter-cutters of 340–290 BC* (Hellenistic culture and society, 20). Berkeley 1995.

Travlos 1971 J. Travlos, *Pictorial dictionary of ancient Athens*. London 1971.

Tréheux 1952 J. Tréheux, 'Études d'épigraphie délienne', *BCH* 76, 1952, 562–595.

Trendall 1938 A.D. Trendall, *Frühhitaliotische Vasen* (Bilder griechischen Vasen). Leipzig 1938.

Tresp 1914 A. Tresp, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Kultschriftsteller* (RGVV, 15:1). Giessen 1914.

Treu 1971 M. Treu, 'Der euripideische Erechtheus als Zeugnis seiner Zeit', *Chiron* 1, 1971, 115–125.

Tsantsanoglou 1997 K. Tsantsanoglou, 'The first columns of the Derveni papyrus and their religious significance', in *Studies on the Derveni papyrus*, eds. A. Laks & G.W. Most, Oxford 1997, 93–128.

Uhsadel-Gülke 1972 C. Uhsadel-Gülke, *Knochen und Kessel* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 43). Meisenheim am Glan 1972.

Usener 1896 H. Usener, *Götternamen: Versuch einer Lehre von der*

religïösen Begriffsbildung³. Bonn 1896.

van der Valk 1979 Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes, vol. 3, ed. M. van der Valk. Leiden 1979.

Vallois 1944 R. Vallois, *L'architecture hellénique et hellénistique à Délos jusqu'à l'éviction des Déliens* (166 av. J.-C.), vol. 1. Les monuments (BEFAR, 157). Paris 1944.

Vanderpool 1965 E. Vanderpool, 'The location of the Attic deme Erchia', *BCH* 89, 1965, 21–26.

Vandiver 1991 E. Vandiver, *Heroes in Herodotus: the interaction of myth and history* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 56). Frankfurt am Main 1991.

Vatin 1965 C. Vatin, 'Délos prémycénienne', *BCH* 89, 1965, 225–230.

de Vaux 1960 R. de Vaux, *Les institutions de l'ancien testament*, vol. 2. *Institutions militaires. Institutions religieuses*. Paris 1960.

Ventris & Chadwick 1973 M. Ventris & J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*². Cambridge 1973.

Verbanck-Piérard 1989 A. Verbanck-Piérard, 'Le double culte d'Héraklès : légende ou réalité ?', in *Entre hommes et dieux. Le convive, le héros, le prophète* (Lire les polythéismes, 2 = Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne, 86), ed. A.-F. Laurens, Paris 1989, 43–65.

Verbanck-Piérard 1992 A. Verbanck-Piérard, 'Herakles at feast in Attic art: a mythical or cultic iconography?', in *The iconography of Greek cult in the Archaic and Classical periods* (Kernos suppl., 1), ed. R. Hägg, Athens & Liège 1992, 85–106.

Verbanck-Piérard 1998 A. Verbanck-Piérard, 'Héros attiques au jour le jour : les calendriers des dèmes', in *Les panthéons des cités, des origines à la Périégèse de Pausanias* (Kernos suppl., 8), ed. V. Pirenne-Delforge, Athens & Liège 1998, 109–127.

Verbanck-Piérard 2000 A. Verbanck-Piérard, 'Les héros guérisseurs : des dieux comme les autres !', in *Héros et héroïnes*, 281–332.

Vernant 1985 J.-P. Vernant, *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs. Étude de psychologie historique* (Fondation). Paris 1985.

Vernant 1989 J.-P. Vernant, 'At man's table: Hesiod's foundation myth of sacrifice', in *Cuisine of sacrifice*, 21–86.

Vernant 1990 J.-P. Vernant, *Myth and society in ancient Greece*. New

York 1990. (Transl. by J. Lloyd of *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne*. Paris 1974.)

Vernant 1991 J.-P. Vernant, *Mortals and immortals. Collected essays* (ed. F.I. Zeitlin). Princeton 1991.

Versnel 1981 H.S. Versnel, 'Self-sacrifice, compensation and the anonymous gods', in *Sacrifice dans l'antiquité*, 135–185 (discussion 186–194).

Veyne 1983 P. Veyne, '« Titulus praelatus » : offrande, solennisation et publicité dans les ex-voto gréco-romains', *RA* 1983, 281–300.

Vian 1955 F. Vian, 'Les Anténorides de Cyrène et les Carneia', *REG* 68, 1955, 307–311.

Vicaire 1979 P. Vicaire, 'Images d'Amphiaraos dans la Grèce archaïque et classique', *BAssBudé* 1, 1979, 2–45.

Visser 1982 M. Visser, 'Worship your enemy: aspects of the cult of heroes in ancient Greece', *HTHR* 75, 1982, 403–428.

Vollgraff 1951 W. Vollgraff, 'Inhumation en terre sacrée dans l'antiquité grecque (à propos d'une inscription d'Argos)', *MemAcInscr* 14:2, 1951, 315–396.

Wächter 1910 Th. Wächter, *Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult* (RGVV, 9:1). Giessen 1910.

Wade-Gery 1933 H.T. Wade-Gery, 'Classical epigrams and epitaphs', *JHS* 53, 1933, 71–104.

Wassner 1883 J. Wassner, *De heroum apud graecos cultu*. Diss. Kiel 1883.

Waszink 1954 J.H. Waszink, 'Biothanati', *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 2, 1954, 391–394.

Waugh 1982 L.R. Waugh, 'Marked and unmarked: a choice between unequals in semiotic structure', *Semiotica* 38, 1982, 299–318.

van Wees 1992 H. van Wees, *Status warriors: war, violence and society in Homer and history* (Dutch monographs on ancient history and archaeology, 9). Amsterdam 1992.

Wehrli 1969 *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, vol. 3. *Klearchos*², ed. F. Wehrli. Basel 1969.

Welcker 1862 F.G. Welcker, *Griechische Götterlehre*, vol. 3. Göttingen 1862.

Wells, Ekroth & Holmgren 1996 B. Wells, G. Ekroth & K. Holmgren,

- ‘The Berbati Valley Project: the 1994 season’, *OpAth* 21, 1996, 189–209.
- Welwei 1991 K.-W. Welwei, ‘Heroenkult und Gefallenenehrung im antiken Griechenland’, in *Tod und Jenseits im Altertum* (Bochumer altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 6), eds. G. Binder & B. Effe, Trier 1991, 50–70.
- Wendel 1935 *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera* (Bibliotheca graeca et latinae auctarium weidmannianum, 4), ed. K. Wendel. Berlin 1935.
- Wescher 1874 *Dionysii Byzantii de Bospori navigatione*, ed. K. Wescher. Paris 1874.
- West 1971–72 M.L. West, *Iambi et elegi graeci ante alexandrum cantati*, vols. 1–2. Oxford 1971–72.
- West 1978 M.L. West, *Hesiod. Work and days, edited with prolegomena and commentary*. Oxford 1978.
- West 1983 M.L. West, *The Orphic poems*. Oxford 1983.
- Whitehead 1986a D. Whitehead, *The demes of Attica 508/7 – ca. 250 BC. A political and social study*. Princeton 1986.
- Whitehead 1986b D. Whitehead, ‘The “greater demarchy” of Erchia’, *AncW* 14, 1986, 57–64.
- Whitley 1994 J. Whitley, ‘The monuments that stood before Marathon: tomb cult and hero cult in Archaic Attica’, *AJA* 98, 1994, 213–230.
- Wide 1907 S. Wide, ‘Chthonische und himmlische Götter’, *Arch RW* 10, 1907, 257–268.
- Wilamowitz 1887 U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, ‘Demotika der Metoeken 2’, *Hermes* 22, 1887, 211–259.
- Wilamowitz 1931 U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, vol. 1. Berlin 1931.
- Wilkins 1993 *Euripides. Heraclidae*, ed. J. Wilkins. Oxford 1993.
- Williams 1978 Ch .K. Williams, II, ‘Corinth 1977, Forum southwest’, *Hesperia* 47, 1978, 1–39.
- Williams, MacIntosh & Fischer 1974 Ch. K. Williams, II, J. MacIntosh & J.E. Fischer, ‘Excavation at Corinth, 1973’, *Hesperia* 43, 1974, 1–76.
- Wilson 1975 *Prolegomena de comoedia. Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes. Scholia in Aristophanis Acharnenses* (Scholia in Aristophanem, 1:1B), ed. N.G. Wilson. Groningen 1975.
- Wittenburg 1990 A. Wittenburg, *Il testamento di Epikteta* (Publicazioni

del dipartimento di scienze dell'antichità. Università degli studi di Trieste, 4). Trieste 1990.

Woodford 1971 S. Woodford, 'Cults of Heracles in Attica', in *Studies presented to George M.A. Hanfmann* (Fogg Art Museum. Harvard University. Monographs in art and archaeology, 2), eds. D.G. Mitten, J.G. Pedley & J.A. Scott, Mainz 1971, 211–225.

Woodhead 1992 A.G. Woodhead, *The study of Greek inscriptions*². London 1992.

Wörner 1884–90 E. Wörner, 'Aiakides', in *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. 1:1, 114.

Wycherley 1957 R.E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora III. Literary and epigraphical testimonia*. Princeton 1957.

Wycherley 1959 R.E. Wycherley, 'Two Athenian shrines', *AJA* 63, 1959, 67–72.

Yavis 1949 C.G. Yavis, *Greek altars. Origins and typology*. Saint Louis 1949.

Young J.H. 1941 J.H. Young, 'Studies in south Attica. The Salaminioi at Porthmos', *Hesperia* 10, 1941, 163–191.

Young R.S. 1939 R.S. Young, *Late Geometric graves and a seventh century well in the Agora* (Hesperia suppl., 2). Athens 1939.

Ziegler 1968 *Plutarchi Vitae parallelae*, vol. 2:2 (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), ed. K. Ziegler. Leipzig 1968.

Ziehen 1899 L. Ziehen, 'Εὐστὸν', *AM* 24, 1899, 267–274.

Ziehen 1929 L. Ziehen, 'Σφάγια', *RE* 3 (1929), 1669–1679.

Ziehen 1939 L. Ziehen, 'Opfer', *RE* 18:1 (1939), 579–627.

Zintzen 1967 *Damascii Vitae Isodori reliquae* (Bibliotheca graeca et latina supplementa curantibus, 1), ed. C. Zintzen. Hildesheim 1967.

Zuntz 1971 G. Zuntz, *Persephone. Three essays on religion and thought in Magna Graecia*. Oxford 1971.

List of illustrations

- 1
Fig. 1 *Horos* from Porto Raphti, Attica, *IG II²* 4977. Drawing after
Rhousopoulos 1862, 83, no.84 30
- 2
Fig.2 Plan of the Archegesion, Delos. Modified after Robert F. 1953, 11,
fig. 1 38
- 3
Fig. 3 Altar dedicated to Hera, sanctuary of Poseidon, Thasos. After
Bon & Seyrig 1929, 334, fig.9 55
- 4
Fig.4 Athenian red-figure volute-krater, c. 500–480BC, Karlsruhe,
Badisches Landes-museum 68.101. Museum photograph 56
- 5
Fig. 5 (a) Athenian red-figure oinochoe, c. 490–480 BC. Athenian Agora
P 15010. Photograph American School of Classical Studies at Athens:
Agora Excavations. (b) Athenian red-figure neck amphora, c. 500–480
BC. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum 741. Museum photograph 57
- 6
Fig. 6 Lucanian kalyx-krater, c. 400–375 BC. Paris, Cabinet des
Médailles 422. From Furtwängler & Reichhold 1900, pl. 60:1 175
- 7
Fig.7 Athenian red-figure kylix, c. 525–550BC. Paris, Louvre G112.
From Stengel 1920, pl.3, fig. 12 243
- 8
Fig. 8 Athenian black-figure pelike, c. 500 BC. Paris, Collection Frits
Lugt 3650, Institut Néerlandais. Museum photograph 244
- 9
Fig.9 Athenian red-figure lekythos, c. 475–450 BC. Munich, Staatliche
Antikensammlungen und Glyptotek, von Schoen 62. Museum

photograph 246

10

Fig.10 (a) Silver coin from Syracuse showing the hero Leukaspis, late 5th century BC, Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung. Museum photograph.

11

(b) Drawing of silver coin from Syracuse showing the hero Leukaspis, late 5th century BC. After Rizzo 1946, 215, fig. 47b 260

12

Fig.11 Fragment of a kylix. Red-figure terracotta, diam. 10.1 cm. Greece, Athenian, c. 490–480 BC. ©The Cleveland Museum of Art, 2001, Dudley P. Allen Fund, 26.242. Museum photograph 272

13

Fig. 12 Athenian black-figure amphora, c. 550 BC. Viterbo, Museo Archeologico Rocca Alborno. Museum photograph 274

Indexes

Inscriptions

AntCl 52, 1983 (= Daux 1983)

152–154: 138, 151, 152¹²³, 155–159

153, lines 13–15: 218

153, lines 15–16: 234⁹⁵

153, line 27: 144, 313¹⁴

153, line 36: 30

BCH

41, 1937, 380–409: 221³⁰

47, 1923, 241–274: 221²⁹

82, 1958, 193–267: 136³¹

86, 1962, 594, no. 15: 21²⁸

87, 1963, 603–610; *see LS* 18

91, 1967, 579, no. 26: 21²⁸

109, 1985, 597–607: 79²⁵⁷

Blinkenberg, *Lindos II. Inscriptions* (1941)

899–946, nos. 580–619: 31–32, 37

904–906, nos. 615–616: 32⁵²

907–909,

nos. 581–586, 593, 595–597, 599–602, 604–608, 610–614: 32⁵¹

nos. 581, 582, 584–586, 592, 593, 595–597, 600, 601, 605–608, 610–614:
31⁴⁹

CIG

1976: 79²⁵⁹

3645: 79, 81

CID (Rougemont 1977)

no. 9 C: 257

no. 10: 150

Corinth VIII: 1 (Meritt 1931)

no. 1: 131⁵

no. 22: 131⁵

Dunant & Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, vol. 2 (1958)

no. 192: 136³¹

GRBS 22, 1981 (= Petropoulou 1981)

48–49: 142, 143, 298405, 320

Hesperia

5, 1935, 19–32, no. 2: 147⁹⁷

11, 1942, 282–287, no. 55: 138, 140–141

24, 1955, 220–239: 33⁵⁸, 37, 77²⁵⁰

47, 1978, 196–197: 136–137

58, 1989, 350: 80–81, 124–125

Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos* (1928)

no. 3: 139⁵³

no. 5: 135²³

Hiller von Gaertringen, *Inschriften von Priene* (1906)

no. 196: 199³¹¹

no. 202:8: 35, 37

ID

35: 36⁷⁸

68: 37⁸⁰

104, 133: 28²⁹

104, 142: 2833, 248¹⁵¹

104, 143: 28³²

104–10, 10: 28^{29, 32, 33}

104–11 B, 35: 28^{32, 33}

104–12, 114: 28^{32, 33}

104–12, 115–116: 28²⁹

409 A, 12: 36^{72, 75}

439 b, 16: 28²⁹

440 A, 38–39: 61¹⁶⁹

440 A, 48: 61¹⁶⁹

442 B, 173: 28²⁹

443 Bb, 96: 28²⁹

444 B, 11: 28²⁹

457, 22: 28²⁹

461 Ab, 32: 38⁸⁵

461 Bb, 52: 28³²

1400, 4: 36⁷², 39

1400, 5: 28²⁹

1401 a–b, 3–5: 28³⁰

1409 Ba, col. II, 26: 36⁷², 39

1409 Bc, col. II, 28: 28²⁹

1416 A, col. I, 14: 28²⁹

1416 A, col. I, 36: 36, 37

1417 A, col. I, 76: 29³⁶

1417 B, col. I, 11: 28²⁹

1417 B, col. I, 37: 36, 37

1442 A, 81: 28²⁹

1452 A, 14: 28²⁹

1452 A, 29: 36, 37

IG I³

5: 146

78: 147

IG I³ (*continued*)

84: 133¹³

234 a: 139⁴⁹, 150¹¹³

241, 14–17: 218¹²

244 C: 141

246D, 29–32: 139

246D, 34–37: 150

255: 150

255 A: 139, 150

255 B: 143⁷⁵

474: 176¹⁹⁶

*IG II*²

120, 46: 28²⁹, 56¹⁵²

140: 147, 334⁸⁷

199 B, 79: 248¹⁵¹

839: 21²⁸, 149¹⁰⁷, 211³⁷⁸

999: 145⁸⁸

1006, 12–13: 33–34, 37, 76–77

1006, 26: 75²⁴², 81, 124, 234⁹⁶

1006, 69: 75, 81, 124, 234⁹⁶

1008, 15: 33⁵⁸, 37, 77²⁵⁰

1009: 77²⁵⁰

1011, 11–12 : 33, 34, 37, 77²⁵⁰

1027: 77²⁵⁰

1028: 77²⁵⁰

1029: 77²⁵⁰

1030: 77²⁵⁰

1032: 33⁵⁸, 77²⁵⁰

1039: 77²⁵⁰

1040: 77²⁵⁰

1041: 77²⁵⁰

1042: 77²⁵⁰

1043: 77²⁵⁰

1126: 150

1146: 150

1195: 139, 148

1252: 145
1252, 7-8: 211³⁷⁸
1253: 145⁸⁸
1254, 11-12: 142
1259, 1-2: 144-145
1262, 6-7: 149
1322, 13: 149¹⁰⁸
1356: 138⁴⁴, 140, 142, 320⁴³
1357 a, 5: 150
1358 B: 151¹¹⁹
1363: 151
1414, 41: 28²⁹
1416, 8: 28^{29,32}
1424 a, 260: 28²⁹
1425, 364: 28²⁹
1440, 53: 28²⁹, 56¹⁵², 57¹⁵³
1492, 70: 28^{29,30}
1496, 134-135: 144
1496, 143: 144
1638, 59: 28²⁹
1638, 68: 28^{32,33}
1639, 1: 28^{29,32}
1639, 9: 28³³
1640, 31: 28^{32,33}
1640, 33-34: 28^{29,32}
1672, 308: 36⁷⁴
1673, 63: 29³⁷
1638 B, 67: 248¹⁵¹
2499: 21²⁸, 144, 148-149, 211³⁷⁸, 300
2501: 21²⁸, 148-149, 211³⁷⁸
4977: 29-30, 37

203: 80-81, 125, 234

IG IV²

40: 226⁵⁶

97: 224-225

118A: 29

IG VII

53: 77-78, 81, 123-124

235, 25-36: 142

421: 30³⁹

IG XI: 2

144 A: 36, 37, 38

145, 58: 56¹⁵²

156A, 23-24: 36, 37

161 A, 97: 38

161 B, 124: 28²⁹, 56¹⁵²

161 B, 128: 28²⁹, 248¹⁵¹

164 B, 12: 28²⁹, 56¹⁵²

164 B, 36: 28²⁹, 56¹⁵²

194, 4: 28³⁰

199 A, 103: 36

199 B, 16: 28³⁰

199 B, 76: 28²⁹, 56¹⁵²

199 B, 79: 28²⁹

199 B, 89: 28²⁹, 56¹⁵²

203A, 32-57: 61¹⁶⁹

203 A, 33: 29

203 B, 44: 28³⁰

203 B, 97: 29³⁷

219 B, 52-53: 28³⁰

219 B, 74: 28²⁹

235, 3: 60-61

287 A, 76: 36

287 A, 107-108: 38

IG XII: 1

791-804: 31⁴⁷

IG XII:3

330: 232⁸⁹

IG XII: 5

593: 202³³¹, 229-230, 256-257

IG XII: 7

515: 135²¹, 232⁸⁹

IG XII Suppl.

353, 10: 221

414: 180²¹⁵, 221, 232⁸⁹

IG XIV

238: 60¹⁶⁶

IGR IV

294: 78, 81

IK, 6. Die Inschriften von Lampsakos (Frisch 1978)

no. 23: 79, 81

IK, 7:2. Die Inschriften von Ephesos (Meriç et al. 1981)

no. 3803 b: 79-80,81

IK, 19- Die Inschriften von Sestos und der thrakischen Chersones (Krauss 1980)

no. 11: 61, 73, 265²⁵²

IK, 24:1. Die Inschriften von Smyrna (Petzl 1987)

no. 737: 35

Jameson, Jordan & Kotansky, A lex sacra from Selinous (1993)

A 8-9= 223³⁹

A 9-12: 264

A 9-13: 235-238

A 9-16: 219²⁰

A 9-17: 221-223, 288³⁷⁰

A 11-12: 220, 222

A12-13: 266

A 13-17: 221-223

A 15-16: 277, 285³⁵⁷

A 17-20: 219, 316, 319⁴¹, 321⁴⁹, 323

A 19-10: 219, 277³⁰⁵, 285³⁵⁷, 332⁸¹

B 12-13: 250¹⁶ \ 264²⁴⁴

B 12: 275

Kaibel, *Epigrammata graeca* (1878)

no. 461: 77-78, 81, 123, 124

no. 1034: 61¹⁷¹

Kernos 12, 1999, 234-235, no. 45: 222³⁴

Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike*, vol. 2 (1914)

no. 43: 179²⁰⁹, 232⁸⁹

no. 45: 31, 137³³, 232⁸⁹

no. 50: 135²¹, 232⁸⁹, 267²⁶⁰

no. 82: 79-80

no. 117: 232⁸⁹

LGS

vol. 1, no. 7: 220²⁵

LS

1A, 12: 150

1 A, 17-19: 139 2C, 2-4: 139

2 C, 6-10: 150

4, 3-5: 334⁸⁷

5, 36-39= 147, 334⁸⁷

10 C, 4-9: 141

11A 4-15: 139, 150

11 B, 8-9= 143⁷⁵

17 A b, 5-8: 218¹²

18: 143, 144, 151-152, 155-157, 161-163

18, col. I, 46-52: 142, 298⁴⁰⁵, 324, 334⁸⁷

18, col. II, 16-22: 133, 144, 239-240

18, col. II, 42-44: 30, 144

18, col. II, 47-52: 142, 324

18, col. III, 3-12: 321⁴⁹

18, col. III, 8-12: 223

18, col. III, 20-25: 224

18, col. III, 33-37: 324

18, col. III, 50-53: 163, 260²¹⁸

18, col. IV, 8-12: 223

18, col. IV, 20-23: 133, 239-240

18, col. IV, 35-40: 142, 324, 334⁸⁷

18, col. IV, 41-46: 288

18, col. V, 12-15: 133, 239-240

18, col. V, 33-48: 324

20 B, 151-152, 157, 159-161

20 B, 2: 147-148, 295³⁹⁷

20 B, 3-4: 138

20 B, 14: 134, 239

20 B, 23: 147-148, 295³⁹⁷

20 B, 23-25: 138

20 B, 33: 288

20 B, 39= 147-148, 295³⁹⁷

20 B, 53-54: 288

28, 5-9= 142

28, 8-9= 138⁴⁴, 140, 320⁴³

31, 7-8: 150

38, 6-7: 148

38, 10-13: 139, 148

47: 144, 148-149, 300

54: 323

69: 142, 320

70: 143

77 C: 257

89, 6: 225⁴⁷

96, 3-5: 320

96, 6-7: 332⁵⁴

96, 22-26: 220²⁷, 316, 322

96, 26-30: 324

96, 35-37: 253, 259

96, 40-41: 323

97 A 2-3: 202³³¹

LS (continued)

97 A, 12-13: 229-230, 256-257

97 A, 14-17: 256

97 B, 1-11: 263

124: 257

132, 3: 323

135: 179²⁰⁹, 232⁸⁹

151A a: 143, 318³⁵

151 A, 32-34: 218, 219, 308¹

151 A, 45-46: 320

151 A, 46-55: 218-219

151 A, 52: 247

151 A, 54-55: 322

151 A, 57-59= 320

151 B, 7-10: 319

151 B, 10-21: 218

151 C, 2-8: 139-140, 145

151 C, 8-15: 219-220

151 D, 1-3: 320

151D, 2: 321⁵⁰

151 D, 4: 321⁵⁰

151 D, 5-17: 252¹⁷²

151 D, 16-17: 223

154 A, 21-22: 263

154 A, 37: 263

156: 320

156A, 9-10: 135²³, 263

156A, 29: 247

156B, 13: 322

156B, 16: 322

157: 320

177: 31, 137³³, 179²⁰⁹, 232⁸

180, 15: 199³¹¹

ISA

16: 257

42 A 4-5: 220

43: 319⁴¹, 320

44, 12: 247

50, 32: 31⁴³

LSS

10 A: 151

10 A 60-74: 147, 334⁸⁷

13: 147, 334⁸⁷

19: 151-152, 155-157, 163-166

19, 19-20: 147, 156, 295

19, 19-24: 141, 313

19, 31-33: 143, 237

19, 34-36: 134

19, 37-39= 134¹⁸, 142

19, 79= 147, 156, 295

19, 84: 133, 147, 238

19, 84-87: 134, 143, 239

19, 89-90: 334⁸⁷

19, 93: 298⁴⁰⁵

20, 6: 298⁴⁰⁵

20, 12-23: 137-138, 140-141, 144

34: 131⁵

61: 135²¹, 232⁸⁹, 267²⁶⁰

63, 5: 221

64: 135-136, 172, 176, 207³⁶⁶, 258, 285, 300

69: 136

70, 5: 247¹⁴³

88 a, 3-6: 323

88 b: 320

115: 131⁵

115 A, 21-25: 263

115A, 61: 32⁵⁴

115 A, 67: 32⁵⁴

115 A, 68: 32⁵⁴

132: 151

Meiggs & Lewis, A sélection of Greek historical inscriptions (1988)

no. 42: 131⁴, 219²²

OGIS

no. 764, 16: 78, 81

Paton & Hicks, The inscriptions of Cos (1891)

no. 39 : 139⁵³

Peek, Inschriften aus den Asklepieion von Epidauros (1969)

no. 43: 224⁴⁶

no. 52: 29³⁴, 48¹¹⁷

Pouilloux, La forteresse de Rhamnonte (1954)

no. 26: 149¹⁰⁸, 167¹⁵⁷

Pouilloux, Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos, vol. 1 (1954)

no. 10a: 221³⁰

no. 129: 143

no. 141: 135-136, 300

Prakt

1959 (1965), 170: 79, 81

1991 (1994), 41-42, no. 15: 149¹⁰⁸

1991 (1994), 43, no. 16: 167¹⁵⁷

Robert J. & L., BullEpigr

4, 1959-63, 59-61, no. 252: 79²⁵⁸

5, 1964-67, 308-311, no. 200: 35⁷⁰

SEG

16, 1959, 418: 79

21, 1965, 541: 161

23, 1968, 207: 79

24, 1969, 277: 29

26, 1976-77, 393: 131⁵

28, 1978, 53: 137

30, 1980, 1119: 289

SEG (continued)

30, 1980, 1387: 79-80

31, 1981, 416: 142, 320

33, 1983, 147: 151

37, 1987, 102: 142

32, 1988, 386: 142, 320

38, 1988, 788: 32

41, 1991, 540: 338¹⁰⁷

SGDI

3208-3209: 148

SIG²

no. 626: 32⁵⁰

Syl1³

1024, 40-41: 323⁵⁸

Ancient authors

Aelianus

VH 5.21 : 93, 97, 113, 118, 123

Aelius Aristides

Alex, epitaph. 85 : 186²⁴³

Contr. Lept. 106 : 110, 113, 114⁴⁰⁴

Hier. log. II 26-27 : 64, 66-69

Smyrna 8 : 104, 105, 106

Aischylos

Ag. 1277-1278 : 255¹⁹³

Epig fr. 55 (Nauck 1889) : 179²¹³, 334⁸⁷

Eum. 106-109 : 43

Eum. 108 : 40, 42

Eum. 806 : 42

Pers. 202-204 : 43

Pers. 203 : 41

Pers. 205 : 40, 42

Psych. no. 125, col. II, 3-4 (Kramer et al. 1980) : 174

Sept. 42-53 : 252

Sept. 275-279 : 202³³¹, 242

Aisopos (Perry 1952)

no. 110 : 196

Alkidamas (Radermacher 1951)

no. 14 : 206

Alkiphron

4.18.16 : 33

Alkman (Page 1962)

no. 7, fr. 1, 6-9 : 205

Ammonios

FGrHist 361 F1 a : 45¹¹⁰, 46, 49

FGrHist 361 F1 b : 26, 45¹¹⁰, 49

Ammonios (Nickau 1966)

Diff. s.v. βωμός : 45¹¹⁰, 49

Andriskos

FGrHist 500 F1 : 92, 95, 96, 103

AnecdotaGraeca (Bekker 1814)

s.v. Ἄγραι : 44¹⁰⁷

s.v. Ἑσχάρα : 51, 52-54

Anthologia Palatina

6.105 : 179²⁰⁹

Apollodoros

Bibl. 2.5.1 : 92, 100, 103, 127

Apollonios Rhodios

Argon. 1.587-588 : 118, 269-270

Argon. 2.1168-1177 : 46, 47

Argon. 3.1026-1041 : 65, 67, 69, 266

Argon. 3.1032-1034 : 64, 69

Argon. 3.1035-1036 : 68

Argon. 3.1104-1222 : 266

Argon. 3.1194-1214 : 65, 67, 69

Argon. 3-1199 : 68

Argon. 3.1207 : 64

Argon. 3-1208 : 68

Argon. 3.1210 : 68

Argon. 3.1211-1220 : 67

Apollonios Sophista (Bekker 1833)

Lex. Hom. s.v. Ἑσχάρα : 51, 52-53

Appian

BCiv. 1.117 : 95, 107, 108

Pun. 84 : 109

Pun. 89 : 109

Archippos

fr. 24 (*PCG* II, 1991) : 25¹⁰

Aristophanes

Av. 819-821 : 149¹⁰⁸

Av. 866-887 : 334⁸⁷

Av. 1231-1233 : 42, 175¹⁹⁰

Av. 1232 : 26, 40, 41

Av. 1490-1493 : 333

Av. 1559-1560 : 174

Eq. 83-84 : 118⁴¹⁵, 249¹⁵⁶

Her. fr. 322 (*PCG* III :2, 1984) : 333

Nub. 409 : 247¹⁴⁴

Pax 1020 : 242

Tag. fr. 504, 12-14 (*PCG* III :2, 1984) : 75,87, 88, 208, 210, 288³⁶⁷

Thesm. 695 : 242

Thesm. 150-155 : 247

Aristotle

Eth. Nic. 1134b : 186, 296⁴⁰¹

Hist. an. 519a 62

Metaph. 1025a : 62

Mund. 400b : 193, 334⁸⁷

[*Pr.*] 863a : 26

Rh. 1361 a : 200³¹⁶

Aristotle (*continued*)

Rh. 1398b : 205-206

Rh. 1400b : 331-332

[Aristotle]

Ath.pol. 7.1 : 252

Ath. pol. 58.1 : 66, 82, 83-85, 96¹¹⁰, 117, 123, 170, 241

Mir. ausc. 840a : 82, 85, 171, 180, 206, 241

Arrianos

Anab. 2.5-9 : 92

Anab. 4.11.2-3 : 334⁸⁸

Anab. 7.14.7 : 92, 99

Anab. 7.23.6 : 99³³²

Athenaios

5.204c : 26

6.262a : 87⁸⁸

7.324a : 245¹³⁹, 248

8.365d : 145

11.462b-c : 47¹¹³

14.662d-e : 247-248

Cassius Dio

64.7.3 : 107, 108

64.13.5 : 109

67.9-3 : 108, 109

67.9-6 : 107, 108

68.8.2 : 107

68.30.1 : 93, 95

69-11.1 : 107

76.13.1 : 107

78.12.6 : 107

78.16.7 : 93, 94 99³²⁹

Chionides

fr. 7 (PCG IV, 1983) : 281

Comicorum atticorum fragmenta (Kock 1888)

Adespota fr. 128 : 64, 66, 68-69

Contra Macartatum

66 : 194, 332, 334⁸⁷

Damaskios (Zintzen 1967)

*Vita*Isidori fr. 131 : 70²²¹

Demochares

FGrHist 75 F1 : 179²¹³, 205³⁵²

Demosthenes

Arist. 67-68 : 252

Decor. 184 : 193-194

Defalsaleg. 139 : 292

Defalsaleg. 280 : 170¹⁰³, 179²¹³

Epitaph. 36 : 84, 197, 204, 262

[*In Neaer.*] 116 : 40,44

Derveni papyrus

col. II, 5 : 254¹⁸⁶

col. VI, 6-7 : 254¹⁸⁶

Dieuchidas

FGrHist 485 F7 : 87

Dio Chrysostomos

Or. 15.10 : 92

Diodorus Siculus

1.2.4 : 334⁸⁸

4.1.4 : 334⁸⁸

4.23.5 : 261

5.56.5-6 : 32

5.58.5 : 87²⁸⁸

11.58.8 : 249¹⁵⁶

15.54.2 : 97³²³

17.17.3 : 92, 94, 96, 99³²⁹

17.115.6 : 99³³²

18.61.1 : 46, 48

20.91-2 : 26

Diogenes Laertios

4.56 : 46, 47

8.33 : 334⁸⁸

10.18 : 104, 105

Dionysios Byzantios

Bosp. 14 : 118⁴¹⁹

Dionysios of Halikarnassos

Ant. Rom. 2.67A : 107

Thuc. 18.6 : 92, 96, 124

Diphilos

fr. 37 (*PCG* V, 1986) : 87, 88

Ephoros

FGrHist 70 F118 : 196-197

Erotianos

Voc. Hipp. 74.80 : 114, 115

Etymologicum Gudianum (Sturtz 1818)

s.v. ἐστία 1 : 51, 53-54 *Etymologicum Magnum* (Gaisford 1848)

s.v. αἱμακουρίαι : 172

s.v. ἐναγίζειν : 114, 115⁴¹², 116, 119, 121, 265²⁴⁸

s.v. ἐσχάρα-. 51, 52-54

s.v. χύτλα : 116, 120

Euripides

Alc. 119 : 40, 41

Alc. 119-120 : 42

Alc. 845 : 255¹⁹³

Andr. 1085-1165 : 43-44

Andr. 1100-1103 : 42

Andr. 1102 : 40, 42

Andr. 1138 : 40, 42, 43

Andr. 1240 : 40, 42

Antiope fr. 48, 99 (Kambitsis 1972) : 206

Euripides (*continued*)

Cret fr. 82, 37 (Austin 1968) : 173¹⁷⁷

Cyc. 384 : 39⁹⁰

El. 91-92 : 255

El. 511-515 :255

El. 801 : 39⁹⁰

Erech. fr. 65, 59-60 (Austin 1968) : 176

Erech. fr. 65, 67-70 (Austin 1968) : 188²⁵³

Erech. fr. 65, 68 (Austin 1968) : 176

Erech. fr. 65, 77-80 (Austin 1968) : 172-173

Erech. fr. 65, 77-89 (Austin 1968) : 186-188, 258

Erech. fr. 65, 79-80 (Austin 1968) : 202-203

Erech. fr. 65, 79-86 (Austin 1968) : 296⁴⁰¹

Erech. fr. 65, 81-86 (Austin 1968) : 173-175

Erech. fr. 65, 90-94 (Austin 1968) : 175-176, 188-189

Hec. 124-126 : 255

Hec. 260-261 : 255

Hec. 391-393 : 155

Hec. 528-537 : 255

Hec. 534-541 : 265-266

Hec. 536-537 : 267

Hec. 1255 : 255¹⁹³

Heracl. 33 : 41

Heracl. 61 : 41

Heracl. 73 : 41

Heracl. 79 : 41

Heracl. 121 : 40, 41, 42

Heracl. 124 : 41

Heracl. 127 : 40, 41, 42

Heracl. 196 : 41

Heracl. 238 : 41

Heracl. 249 : 41

Heracl. 341 : 40, 41, 42

Heracl. 344 : 41

Heracl. 1026-1036 : 255

Heracl. 1040-1043 : 255

HF 922 : 40, 41, 42, 47, 54¹⁴⁵
HF 926-930 : 42
HF 974 : 41
Hipp. 1423-1427 : 201³²⁴, 206³⁵⁸
Hipp. 1437-1439 : 331⁷⁷
Ion. I fr. 446 (Halleran 1995) : 206
Ion 376 : 32
IT 384 : 173¹⁷⁷
IT 947-960 : 288³⁶⁸
Phoen. 274 : 40, 41, 43
Phoen. 284 : 40, 42
Supp. 33 : 40, 41, 42, 44
Supp. 65 : 41
Supp. 93 : 41
Supp. 290 : 40, 41, 42, 44
Supp. 1194-1202 : 42, 252
Supp. 1200 : 40, 42, 44
Tro. 622-623 : 255¹⁹³
 fr. 628 (Nauck 1889) : 40, 42
 Eustathios (van der Valk 1979)
Il. 10.418 : 51, 52-54
 Eustathios (Stallbaum 1825-26)
Od. 6.305 : 45¹⁰⁹, 51, 52-54
Od. 7.153 : 51, 52, 54
Od. 10.517 : 71, 72
Od. 14.159 : 51, 53
Geoponica (Beckh 1895)
 20.46.6 : 248
 Gregorios of Nyssa
Encom. xlmart. II 776M : 110, 111, 113
 Harmodios of Lepreum
FGrHist 319F1 : 189²⁵⁷

Harpokration (Dindorf 1853)

s.v. ἔσχάρα : 44¹⁰⁶, 51, 52-53

s.v. προσχαιρητήρια : 33

Heliodoros

Aeth. 1.17.5 : 64, 66, 68-71, 94, 96, 117

Aeth. 1.18.4 : 46, 49

Aeth. 1.28.1 : 103³⁵⁰, 111, 112, 114

Aeth. 1.30.5 : 48¹¹⁸

Aeth. 2.18.2 : 104, 105, 106

Aeth. 2.34.7 : 94

Aeth. 2.35.2 : 94, 100³³⁵

Aeth. 2.35.3 : 94

Aeth. 3.1.1 : 94

Aeth. 3.1.3-5 : 103

Aeth. 3.5.2-3 : 95, 100, 103

Aeth. 3.6.1 : 103

Aeth. 3.10.1-3 : 103

Aeth. 4.18.6 : 46, 48

Aeth. 4.20.3 : 94

Aeth. 6.13.6-6.14.6 : 103³⁵⁰, 109

Aeth. 6.14.3-6 : 64, 66, 68-69, 265

Aeth. 10.16.7 : 111, 112

Herodianos

Div. Marc. 4.8.7 : 94 100³³⁵

Herodotos

1.59 : 192

1.65 : 331

1.66-68 : 211

1.126 : 292

1.165 : 217⁹

1.167 : 82, 83, 97, 170, 197, 239

1.168 : 203, 208, 211

2.44 : 82, 85-86, 98, 127, 171, 197, 208, 219-220, 226, 297

Herodotos (*continued*)

2.119 : 174¹⁸⁴

3.24 : 288³⁶⁷

4.33-35 : 200-202

4.35 : 298⁴⁰⁵

5.47 : 197-198

5.67 : 182-183, 197

5.92 : 202, 232-233

5.112-114 : 198

5.114 : 197, 198³⁰⁶, 208, 211

6.38 : 197, 199, 208, 209

6.61 : 149¹⁰⁸

6.117 : 21²⁶

7.43 : 179²¹³, 197

7.117 : 197, 198, 208, 209, 211, 293

7.191 : 174¹⁸⁴

8.37-39 : 21²⁶

9.85 : 78

Heropythos

FGrHist 448F1 : 178

Hesiod

Theog. 73-74 : 199³¹³

Theog. 112-113 : 199³¹³

Theog. 280 : 174¹⁸⁷

Theog. 881-885 : 199³¹³

Hesychios (Latte 1953-66)

s.v. αἵμακουρίαι (A 1939) : 114, 115, 120, 172

s.v. ἀποφράδες (A 6792) : 114, 115

s.v. ἐγγριμᾶσθαι (E 148) : 114, 115

s.v. ἐναγίζειν (E 2586) : 114, 115, 119, 121, 265²⁴⁸

s.v. ἐναγίσματα (E 2587) : 115, 120

s.v. έναγισμοί (E 2588) : 115, 120

s.v. ἐντέμνουσι (E 3346) : 115, 120

s.v. ἐσχάρα (E 6446) : 51, 52-53

s.v. ἐσχάραι (E 6447) : 53-54

s.v. θεσσαλώπας (Θ 407) : 115

s.v. κοτυλίσκος (K 3818) : 71, 72

s.v. μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαροῦ θανάτῳ (M 1210) : 114, 115

s.v. μίμαρκυς (M 1371) : 248¹⁴⁶

Hippokrates

Art. 11.30 : 26

Art. 11.40 : 26

Art. 11.60 : 26

Art. 11.70 : 26

Corde 5 : 62¹⁷³

[Ep.] 27 (Littré 1839-61) : 92, 95, 96

Morb. sacr. (Littré 1839-61) : 333⁸³

Nat. mul. 109 : 62

Hipponax

fr. 166 (West 1971-72) : 248¹⁴⁷

Homer

Il. 1.458-459 : 269-270

Il. 2.550-551 : 189²⁵⁹

Il. 3.292-301 : 252¹⁷²

Il. 3.310 : 252¹⁷²

Il. 17.58 : 62

Il. 19-267-268 : 217⁹

Il. 22.510-514 : 233

Il. 23-6-58 : 228

Il. 23-22-23 : 255

Il. 23.30-34 : 254-255

Il. 23.166-178 : 228, 254-255

Il. 23.175-176 : 255

Il. 24.532 : 228⁶⁴

Od. 3.444-455 : 273

Od. 6.92 : 62 *Od.* 7.100 : 43

Od. 10.504-540 : 254

Od. 10.517-542 : 62

Od. 10.526-540 : 254¹⁸⁸

Od. 10.527-528 : 271

Od. 11.23-43 : 265

Od. 11.23-50 : 62, 254

Od. 11.24 : 275 *Od.* 11.25 : 62

Od. 11.35 : 174

Od. 11.35-36 : 62, 271

Od. 11.42 : 62

Od. 11.48 : 275

Od. 11.95 : 62

Od. 11.95-99 : 285-286

Od. 11.97-99 : 265, 267

Od. 11.601-604 : 86

Od. 14.414-456 : 281

Od. 14.420 : 28²⁸, 39

Od. 14.437-438 : 220²⁷

Od. 20.25-28 : 247

Homeric hymn to Hermes

112 : 62 122-123 : 247

Hypereides

Epitaph. 21 : 204, 208, 209

Epitaph. 27-30 : 262²³³

Iamblichos

VP 27.122 : 110-111, 114

Ion

fr. 54 (Nauck 1889) : 63

Isaios

2.46 : 86,87

6.51 : 87,88

6.65 : 87, 88

7.30 : 87

Isokrates

Hel. 63 : 208, 209

Philip 33 : 21²⁷

Plat. 60 : 205

Josephus

AJ 3-148 : 46, 48

AJ 3-149 : 46, 48

AJ 8.4.1 : 80²⁶⁵

AJ 19.272 : 108, 112³⁹³

BJ 1.32 : 112, 113, 235⁹⁸

BJ 1.39- 112, 113, 235⁹⁸

BJ 1.148 : 112, 113, 235⁹⁸

BJ 6.98 : 112, 113, 235⁹⁸

Julianus imperator

Ep. 79 : 99³²⁹

Kallimachos

Aet. fr. 43, 80-83 : 267

Aet. fr. 238, 11 : 133, 240

Kallixeinos

FGrHist 627F 2, 34 : 46, 48

Klearchos

fr. 58 (Wehrli 1969) : 87, 88

Kleidemos

FGrHist 323 F1 : 35⁶⁹, 40, 44

FGrHist 323 F14 : 87, 265²⁴⁸

Konon

FGrHist 26 F1, 45.6 : 180²¹⁵, 334⁸⁸

Libanios

Decl. 13.59 : 94, 96³¹⁰, 124⁴⁵⁰

Progym. 2.13 : 104, 105

Lucian

Cal. 17 : 99³³²

Catapl. 2 : 104, 105, 106

Charon 22 : 64, 66, 68-69

Deastr. 24 : 63, 64

Demerc. 28 : 104, 105

De sacr. 9 : 242

De sacr. 13 : 242

Menip. 9 : 64, 65, 68-69

Philops. 14 : 64, 66-67, 69, 266

Philops. 21 : 104-105

Scythia 1 : 207³⁶⁶

Scythia 1-2 : 258²⁰⁸

Lykophron

Alex. 684 : 63, 64

Lykourgos

fr. 6.10 (Conomis 1970) : 40, 44

Lysias

Epitaph. 80 : 204, 262

Markellos

fr. 125 (Klostermann & Hansen 1991) : 110, 113, 118

Matron

Convivium (Brandt 1888) 94 : 247

Menander

Synepheboi fr. 459 (Edmunds 1961) : 333

Metrodoros

FGrHist 43 F 3 : 224

Mimnermos

fr. 18 (West 1971-72) : 339¹⁰⁸

Neanthes

Orphic Argonautica

568-572 : 64, 69

569-575 : 66

571-572 : 66, 69

572-575 : 68

950-951 : 69

950-987 : 64, 65, 67

957-958 : 68

960-963 : 69

966-982 : 67

Parthenios

Amat. Narr. 35.2 : 26l

Pausanias

1.4.4 : 92, 94, 95, 100

1.15.3 : 21²⁶

1.26.5 : 94

1.29.2 : 33

1.29.15 : 84²⁷⁷

1.32.4 : 76

1.32.4-5 : 26l²²⁴

1.41.9 : 94²⁹⁷

1.42.7 : 94

1.43.3 : 78

1.44.5 : 94

2.3.7 : 94²⁹⁷

2.10.1 : 92, 98, 101, 103, 126, 127

2.11.7 : 92, 100, 308¹

2.12.1 : 64, 66-67, 70

2.20.3 : 92, 94, 100³³⁷

2.22.3 : 64, 66, 68, 70

2.24.1 : 249¹⁵⁶, 265²⁵²

2.32.1 : 94

3.1.8 : 92,95

3.12.7 : 97

3.13.7 : 94

3.19-3 : 92, 94, 99, 100³³⁷, 104 334⁸⁷

3.20.8 : 94

4.3.10 : 93, 100³³⁵

4.14.7-4.22.7 : 79

4.17.4 : 46, 47

4.30.3 : 94

4.32.3 : 79, 93, 94 103

5.4.3 : 93

Pausanias (*continued*)

5.4.4 : 93, 94

5.13.1-3 : 94, 190²⁶³

5.13.2 : 64, 66-68, 70, 94 176, 191²⁷¹, 192²⁷²

5.13.2-4 : 71

5.13.3 : 264, 334⁸⁷

5.13.8-11 : 49

5.13.9 : 46, 48

5.14.8-10 : 49

5.24.9-11 : 252

6.11.2-9 : 21²⁸

6.20.15 : 94

6.20.15-20 : 94²⁹⁷

6.20.17 : 94

6.21.9 : 94

6.21.9-11 : 93, 96

6.21.11 : 94

7.17.8 : 93, 94

7.17.13-14 : 94

7.17.14 : 93, 97³²⁰

7.18.11-13 : 125⁴⁵⁴

7.19-10 : 93, 94, 100³³⁵

7.20.9 : 93, 94, 100³³⁷

7.24.1 : 93, 94, 97

8.7.2 : 217⁹

8.14.9-10 : 94 8.14.10 : 93, 96

8.14.11 : 93, 94, 96, 100³³⁷

8.23.7 : 93, 94, 96

8.34.1-3 : 222³⁶

8.34.3 : 110, 111

8.41.1 : 93, 94 96

9-3.7 : 29³⁶

9.5.14 : 93, 94 96

9-13.6 : 93,97

9-18.3 : 93, 94

9-18.4 : 93, 95

9.29.6 : 93, 99, 334⁸⁷

9-37.7 : 64,66-67

9-38.5 : 93, 94 97

9.39-4 : 94

9.39-6 : 64, 66-68, 70-71, 94 265

10.4.10 : 236, 259²¹⁷, 323⁵⁸

10.24.5 : 43

10.24.6 : 93, 94, 95, 100

10.27.2 : 46, 47

10.29.8 : 63, 64

Phanodemos

FGrHist 325 F11 : 288³⁶⁸

Philochoros

FGrHist 328 F10 :194

FGrHist 328 F12 : 188, 296⁴⁰¹

FGrHist 328 F 25 : 196

Philostephanos

FHG III, 29, Fl : 178

Philostratos

Her. 31.8 : 104, 105

Her. 43.14 : 63, 64

Her. 52.3 : 93, 95, 104

Her. 53.5 : 110, 111, 114

Her. 53-8 : 93, 222³⁶

Her. 53.8-13 : 101

Her. 53.8-14 : 123

Her. 53.8-15 : 99, 127

Her. 53.11 : 64, 66, 69-70, 103

Her. 53-11-12 : 67-68, 267, 285

Her. 53.11-13 : 71, 95, 222³⁶

Her. 53-13 : 93, 207³⁶⁶, 258²⁰⁸

Her. 53-15 : 93

Her. 53-17 : 93

Her. 53-19 : 94

Her. 53-23 : 104, 105

Imag. 2.16.3 : 81, 94 100³³⁸, 103

Imag. 2.27.3 : 32

Imag. 2.29.4 : 104, 105

VA 1.1 : 242

VA 4.16 : 64, 65, 67, 93, 94 99³³⁰, 127, 266

VA 6.11 : 64, 66

VA 8.7.9 : 64, 67, 73

Photius *Lex.* (Theodoridis 1982-98)

s.v. αἰγὸς τρόπον (Λ 532) : 111, 115, 117

s.v. ἐναγίζων (Ε 794) : 116, 119, 120

s.v. ἐναγίσματα (Ε 792) : 114, 116, 120

s.v. ἐναγίσματα (Ε 793) : 114, 116

s.v. ἐναγισμοί (Ε 795) : 116, 120

s.v. ἔστιά (E 2025) : 51, 53

s.v. ἐσχάρα (E 2041) : 51, 52-53

s.v. ἐσχάρα (E 2042) : 44¹⁰⁶, 51, 52, 54

s.v. ἐσχάρας (E 2044) : 54

Pindar

Isthm. 4.61-68 : 119, 181-182

Isthm. 4.62 : 298⁴⁰⁵

Isthm. 5.30-31 : 196

Isthm. 5.32-33 : 205, 239¹¹⁴

Nem. 3.22 : 86

Nem. 7.46-48 : 119, 183

Ol. 1.46-53 : 192²⁷⁴

Ol. 1.48-49 : 192²⁷⁴

Ol. 1.90 : 67¹⁹⁵, 102³⁴⁷, 118

Ol. 1.90-91 : 171-172

Ol. 1.90-92 : 178, 285

Ol. 1.90-93 : 190-192

Ol. 1.93 : 176, 298⁴⁰⁵

Ol. 3.19 : 115⁴¹²

Pindar (*continued*)

Ol. 7.40-49 : 32

Ol. 1.11-m-. 208, 210

Ol. 9-112 : 181²²¹, 182, 298⁴⁰⁵

Pyth. 5.85-86 : 119, 177

Pyth. 5.95 : 203

Plato

Leg. 717a-b : 193, 332, 334⁸⁷

Leg. 738d : 212³⁸⁵

Leg. 818c 193²⁷⁸

Leg. 947d : 263²³⁶

Leg 244a : 84, 197, 204

Menex. 249b : 197, 204, 262

Resp. 392a : 193²⁷⁸

Resp. 427b : 192-193, 332, 334⁸⁷

Resp. 540b-c : 212

[Plato]

Min. 315c : 228-229, 254, 256

Plato comicus

fr. 200 (PCG VII, 1989) : 26

Plutarch

Am. narr. 114a : 97³²³, 261, 266²⁵⁴

DeIs. etOs. 359b : 111, 112

Demalign. Her. 857d : 92, 98, 127

Demalign. Her. 857f : 92, 95

Demalign. Her. 872f : 124

Demul. vir. 255d-e : 334⁸⁸

Quaest. conv. 694a-b : 224⁴³

Quaest. Graec. 296f-297a : 230⁷⁵

Quaest. Graec. 299b : 34⁶⁷

Quaest. Rom. 268b : 108

Quaest. Rom. 270a : 104, 105, 106, 265²⁴⁸

Quaest. Rom. 272d-e : 107, 108

Quaest. Rom. 285b : 108

Quaest. Rom. 287a : 107

Quaest. Rom. 290d : 258²⁰⁸

Vit. Alex. 72.3 : 92, 99³³², 105³⁶⁷

Vit. Alex. 72.3-4 : 95, 100

Vit. Alex. 72.4 : 103

Vit. Arist. 21.1-5 : 262²²⁹, 267

Vit. Arist. 21.2 : 92, 95, 103, 122

Vit. Arist. 21.2-5 : 96, 102, 124, 275

Vit. Arist. 21 A : 202³³¹

Vit. Arist. 21.5 : 122, 172, 285

Vit. Brut. 45.8 : 108

Vit. Cat. Mai. 15.3 : 108, 109

Vit. Galb. 22.2 : 108

Vit. Lyc. 12.6 : 247

Vit. Num. 19.5 : 108

Vit. Pel. 21-22 : 97³²³, 201, 266²⁵⁴, 270-271

Vit. Pel. 22.2 : 207³⁶⁶, 258²⁰⁸, 270²⁷⁶

Vit. Pyrrh. 31.1 : 95, 105, 174¹⁸⁶

Vit. Sol. 9.1 : 207³⁶⁶, 258²⁰⁸, 261, 266²⁵⁴

Vit. Sol. 21.5 : 104, 105, 228

Vit. Them. 31.6 : 249¹⁵⁶

Vit. Thes. 4.1 : 92, 100, 103, 122

PMG (Page 1962)

fr. 991 : 39⁹⁰, 40

Polemon

FHG III, 136, F 75 : 46,47

Pollux (Bethe 1900-31)

Onom. 1.7-8 : 50, 51

Onom. 1.8 : 54

Onom. 3.102 : 114, 115

Onom. 6.57 : 247

Onom. 8.86 : 252

Onom. 8.91 : 84²⁷⁶, 96³¹⁰, 115, 117

Onom. 8.146 : 114, 115

Onom. 10.96 : 28³³

Onom. 10.105 : 248¹⁵¹

Polybios

23.10.17 : 92, 96, 103, 118, 265²⁴⁸

Porphyrios

Abst. 2.26.1-2 : 328⁷⁶

Abst. 2.36.4 : 46

Abst. 4.22.7 : 179²¹², 202³³⁰

Deantr. nymph. 6 : 46, 61¹⁷⁰, 64, 66

Dephil. 112 : 110, 112, 113⁴⁰²
Dephil. 112-121 : 47^{U1}, 73
Dephil. 114 : 64, 66, 68, 110, 112³⁹⁶
Dephil. 117 : 113⁴⁰²
De phil. 118 : 64, 66
De phil. 120 : 113⁴⁰²
 Ptolemaios of Askalon (Heylbut 1887)
 s.v. βωμός : 50, 51, 52
 Ptolemaios Chennos (Chatzis 1914)
 3.12 : 92, 98, 127
 schol. Aesch.
Cho. 23b (Smith 1976) : 114, 116
Cho. 484c (Smith 1976) : 114, 116, 120
Pers. 203 (Dindorf 1851) : 51, 53
Pers. 203 (Massa Positano 1963) : 51, 53
Pers. 205b (Massa Positano 1963) : 51, 53
PV, VitaAeschyli 11 (Herrington 1972) : 116, 118
Sept. 73i (Smith 1982) : 51, 53
Supp. 122 (Smith 1976) : 114, 116
 schol. Ap. Rhod. (Wendel 1935)
Argon. 1.587 : 114, 116, 118, 120, 174¹⁸⁶, 269-270
Argon. 1.826b : 66¹⁸⁸
Argon. 1.1075-77a : 116, 120
Argon. 2.1172 : 52
 schol. Ar.
Ach. 961 (Pfister 1909-12, p. 473) : 114, 116, 119
Ach. 888a (Wilson 1975) : 51
Ach. 1112a II (Wilson 1975) : 248¹⁴⁶
Eq. 84b (Jones & Wilson 1969) : 116, 118
Eq. 1286a (Jones & Wilson 1969) : 51, 54
Eq. 1286c (Jones & Wilson 1969) : 51
Ran. 293 (Koster 1962) : 114, 116

schol. Dion Byz. (Wescher 1874)

Bosp. 19 : 116, 118⁴¹⁹

schol. Eur. (Schwaitz 1887)

Phoen. 274 : 50, 52-53, 71, 72, 114, 116, 120

schol. Hom.

Il. 1.459 (Dindorf 1875) : 269-270

Il. 1.459 (Erbse 1969-88) : 270²⁷²

Il. 1.464b¹-b² (Erbse 1969-88) : 115, 117, 120

Il. 3.273b (Erbse 1969-88) : 117, 120

Il. 16.231 (Erbse 1969-88) : 52

Il. 23.75-76 (Erbse 1969-88) : 117

Od. 1.291 (Dindorf 1855) : 114, 117, 121, 265²⁴⁸

Od. 10.517 (Dindorf 1855) : 71, 72

Od. 23.71 (Dindorf 1855) : 52

schol. Luc. (Rabe 1906)

Catapl. 2 : 114, 117

Tim. 43 : 114, 117

schol. Nie. (Crugnola 1971)

Ther. 860a : 114, 117

schol. Opp. (Bussemaker 1849)

Hal. 5.307 : 52, 54

schol. Pind. (Drachmann 1903-27)

Isthm. 4.104b : 117, 119

Nem. 7.62c : 117, 119, 120

Nem. 7.68a : 183²³²

Ol. 1.146a : 114, 117, 120, 172¹⁷⁰

Ol. 1.146b : 117

Ol. 1.146a-d : 118, 120

Ol. 1.146d : 117, 120, 172¹⁷⁰

Ol. 1.150a : 117, 118, 191²⁷⁰

Ol. 1.150b : 191²⁷⁰

Ol. 3.33b : 115, 117

Ol. 3-33d : 117

Pyth. 5.113b : 117, 119

schol. [Pl.] (Greene 1938)

Min. 315c : 256

schol. Soph. (Papageorgius 1888)

OC 100 : 188²⁵², 296⁴⁰¹

schol. Thuc. (Hude 1927)

3.58.4 : 117, 118

5.11.1 : 117, 118

Simonides (Campbell 1991)

no. 532 : 262²³³

no. 534 : 78

Sopater

Diair. zet. 200 : 104, 105

Diair. zet. 238 : 94, 97

Sophilos

fr. 6 (PCG VII, 1989) : 247

Sophokles

Ant. 1016 : 40, 41, 49¹²⁷

OC 621-622 : 261, 267

Phil. 400 : 173¹⁷⁷

fr. 38 (Radt 1977) : 40

fr. 730 (Radt 1977) : 40

Soranos

Vit. Hipp. 3.6 : 92, 123 Stephanos of Byzantium (Meinecke 1849)

s.v. βωμοί : 51, 52

Stesimbrotos

FGrHist 107 F 9 : 262

Strabon

6.1.15 : 92, 95

6.3.9 : 92, 103, 265

9.2.11 : 46, 47

13.1.32 : 92, 94, 96, 99, 127

14.5.17 : 92

Suda (Adler 1928-35)

s.v. ἀπαργμάτων ὠρίων χαιριώτερον

(A 2921) : 114, 116

s.v. ἀποφράδες ἡμέραι (A 3642) : 114, 116

s.v. ἐναγίζειν (E 1092) : 114, 116, 119

s.v. ἐναγίζων (E 1093) : 116, 118, 119

s.v. ἐναγισμοί (E 1094) : 116, 120

s.v. ἐσχάρα (E 3242) : 44¹⁰⁶, 51, 52

s.v. προσχαιρητήρια (Π 2851) : 33

s.v. προχαριστήρια (Π 2928) : 33

s.v. χόας (X 364) : 114, 116, 119

Synesios

Hymn. 6.27 : 111, 112, 113

Tertullianus

Apol. 9.13-14 : 250

Thebais (Allen 1912)

fr. 2 : 261²²⁸

Theokritos

Epigr. 1.5 : 242

Theophrastos

Char. 8.6 : 247

Char. 9.4 : 248¹⁵²

Char. 16.9 : 263²³⁷

Hist. pl. 5.9-7 : 26

fr. 13 (Potscher 1964) : 328⁷⁶

Thucydides

2.34-46 : 262

2.35 : 204

3.58 : 118, 124, 179, 202, 204

5.11 : 118, 172, 176, 184-186, 203, 207, 208, 211, 257-258, 285, 296⁴⁰¹

6.56-57 : 241¹³⁰

Xenophon

An. 2.2.9 : 252

An. 5.3.7-10 : 292³⁸⁸

An. 5.8.9 : 62

An. 6.1.2-4 : 292

An. 6.2.15 : 21²⁷

Cyr. 3.3.21-22 : 194

Cyr. 8.3.12 : 40, 45

Cyr. 8.3.24 : 176, 217¹⁰

Cyr. 8.7.1 : 288³⁶⁷

Hell. 6.4.7 : 97³²³

Hell. 6.4.29 : 150¹¹⁵

Hell. 7.3.12 : 203, 208, 209, 211

Lac. 15-9 : 206,208,209,211

Mem. 2.3.11 : 292

Oec. 19.7 : 62

Oec. 19.13 : 62

Greek terms

ἄβατον: 186-188, 258

ἀγίζω: 89²⁹⁴, 115⁴¹²

ἄγιος: 235⁹⁹

ἀγνός: 235⁹⁹

ἄγος: 121, 235⁹⁹, 264-205

αἷμα: 62, 65, 247, 255¹⁹⁰, 256²⁰⁰, 259²¹⁷, 261²²⁸, 267, 271; *see also* blood

αἱμακουρία: 74, 102, 118, 120, 171-172, 176, 178, 190-192, 250, 262²²⁹, 266-267, 269, 275²⁸⁹, 294, 296, 305, 309; *see also* blood, blood rituals

αἱμάσσω: 242

αἱμάτιον: 247-248; *see also* sausage

ἄλσος-. 94

ἄμνιον: 244¹³⁷; *see also* σφαγεῖον

ἀμφίπολοι: 191

ἀπάργματα: 219, 319⁴¹

ἀπαρχαί: 124⁴⁵⁰, 179, 195, 202, 276, 294

ἀποδειροτομέω: 62, 174, 271

ἀποθύω: 50¹³⁰

ἀποπέμπω: 194-195, 294

ἀποσφάζω: 247, 255¹⁹⁵

ἀποτέμνω: 174¹⁸⁶, 270²⁷⁴

ἄπυρα Ιερά: 32

ἄρπαξ: 248¹⁴⁹

ἀρχηγέτης: 167¹⁵⁷, 203, 208-212; *see also* Héros Archegetes

βαιοθάνατος: 98, 264, 332-333; *see also* violent death

βόθρος: 14, 16¹⁴, 23-24, 46, 50, 53¹⁴⁰, 60-74, 94, 101, 109, 120, 174, 176¹⁹⁵, 191²⁷¹, 201³²⁶, 221³¹, 226⁵⁵, 265, 271, 274-276, 298, 306, 310, 312, 316; *see also* pit, blood

βουθυσία: 189²⁵⁷

βουθυτέω: 136³¹

βούθυτος: 175, 189, 294

βουκόπια: 32

βουκτόνος: 173, 176, 186-187, 296⁴⁰¹

βωμός: 15, 25-27, 29³⁶, 31, 41-43, 46, 47-50, 52-54, 58-59, 60, 80²⁰⁵, 94, 101, 103, 115⁴¹², 125⁴⁵⁴, 141-142, 157, 166, 181-182, 191-192, 201-202, 218, 253, 298, 308-309, 334⁸⁷; *see also* altar

βώμιος ἐσχάρα :. 40, 41

βωμὸς τέφρας: 48-49; *see also* ash-altar

γένος: 130, 133-134, 141, 147, 151-153, 156, 163-168, 238, 318³⁵, 319⁴², 321; *see also* Salaminioi

γέρα: 200³¹⁶, 205, 218, 221²⁹, 261²²⁸, 31 9⁴¹, 319⁴², 320⁴³; *see also* perquisite, meat (portions of), ἱερώσυνα

δαίς: 14, 67, 71, 101-102, 181-182, 267,

285; *see also* meal

δαινύσθων αὐτοῦ: 316-317, 323⁵⁸

δαπανάω: 119, 196

δεῖπνον: 14, 43, 102, 267, 276, 285; *see also* meal

δέκομαί,: 119, 177

δέκομαι,: 177

ἐκφορά: 143⁷⁷, 229⁶⁸, 254, 256, 319⁴²

ἐλάστερος: 210³⁷⁷, 250¹⁴¹, 264²⁴⁴, 266, 275, 279³¹⁷

ἔμπυρα: 118, 120, 181

ἐναγίζω: 14, 17, 23-24, 50, 59¹⁵⁷, 68, 69, 70-71, 74-128, 170-171, 180, 195²⁹⁰, 197-198, 207-208, 220, 233-235, 237-239, 241, 256²⁰³, 262²³³, 264, 205²⁴⁸, 270²⁷⁴, 275²⁸⁹, 280, 294, 296-297, 307-309, 310, 329, 331-333; *see also* destruction sacrifice

ἐνάγισμα-. 14, 17, 23-24, 74-75, 81-128, 170-171, 208, 210, 216, 233-235, 237, 241, 265²⁴⁸, 270, 280, 288³⁰⁷, 294, 296, 297, 307, 309, 310; *see also* destruction sacrifice

ἐναγισμός: 14, 17, 23-24, 74-75, 78-82, 86-128, 170, 216, 226⁵⁵, 233-235, 256²⁰³, 265²⁴⁸, 297, 307, 310; *see also* destruction sacrifice

ἐναγστήριον: 17, 23-24, 59¹⁵⁸, 74-75, 80-82, 121-122, 124, 234, 307-308

ἐνατεύω: 220-221, 309, 316, 329, 332

ἐντέμνω 23, 68²⁰¹, 74, 101, 118, 135-136, 148, 172-173, 176, 184-186, 190, 198, 203³³⁵, 207-208, 250, 257-258, 261, 269, 270-271, 294, 296, 299-300, 305, 309

ἐντομα: 69, 118, 120, 173-174, 250, 267, 270-271, 297

ἐορτή: 183

ἐπισφάζω 105³⁶⁶

ἐπιχθόνιοι θεοί: 110, 112; *see also* chthonian divinities

ἐπουράνιοι θεοί: 50¹³¹; *see also* Olympian divinities

ἐστία: 26¹², 42, 43, 48, 49, 53-54, 59, 309; *see also* ἱστία, hearth

ἐστιατόριον: 38-39, 58, 201³²², 221³¹, 308; *see also* dining-room

ἐστιάτωρ: 140, 144; *see also* ἱστιάτωρ, host

ἐσχάρα: 14, 17, 23-59, 60, 62¹⁷³, 71-72, 74, 75, 125⁴⁵⁴, 137³³, 195²⁹⁰, 201³²⁶, 221³¹, 297, 308-310; *see also* altar, hearth

αὐτόστροφος ἐσχάρα: 28

αὐτοσχέδια ἐσχάραι: 48

βώμιος ἐσχάρα: 41

ἐσχαρίδιον: 25⁹, 27²⁷

ἐσχάριον: 25⁹, 27²⁷

ἐσχαρίς: 25⁹, 27²⁷, 28³⁰, 29³⁷, 57¹⁵³

ἐσχαρών: 17, 23-26, 36-39, 57-58, 308, 323⁵⁸

εὐστά: 134¹⁹

ἥροξείνια: 130, 136, 284-286, 294, 305

ἥρωιξείνια: 136³¹

ἥρῳον: 80, 94, 135²³, 179²¹³, 183, 195²⁹⁰, 196²⁹¹, 197, 205³⁵², 263, 280³²⁵, 334⁸⁸, 336⁹²

ἥρως, use and meaning of term: 18, 21-22, 34⁶⁷, 86, 99, 132⁷, 147⁹⁹, 211; *see also* ὥς ἥρω

in relation to θεός: 21-22, 86, 149, 211

θαλάσσιοι θεοί: 110, 112

θεοδαΐσια: 32

θεοξένια: 14, 20, 31, 32⁵¹, 102, 130, 136-140, 145⁹¹, 169, 177-179, 191²¹⁹, 182, 184, 190-192, 202, 212, 213, 215, 217, 219, 221, 227, 237, 266, 276-286, 291, 293, 294, 298, 299, 304-305, 306, 309, 318-319, 324; *see also* food, meal, table, τράπεζα

θεός, use and meaning of term: 21-22, 86, 99³³², 106³⁷², 149, 211; *see also* ἥρωας

θήκη: 201-202

θυλήματα: 47

θῦμα: 222³⁵, 223³⁸, 319⁴

θυμέλη: 41, 54

θύος: III³⁹²

θυσία: 15-16, 20, 30, 31-33, 42, 43, 47, 50, 67, 71, 77, 83-85, 87²⁸⁸, 88, 89, 94, 98-102, 104, 110, 112-113, 115, 119, 120, 123, 126-128, 129-130, 133, 136-150, 154-156, 166, 169, 171-173, 177-199, 202-205, 207-212, 215-221, 223-224, 227-228, 230, 235, 236-239, 241-244, 249-250, 252, 253, 256²⁰², 257-260, 262, 264²⁴¹, 269-270, 273, 275-277, 281-301, 303-310, 312-314, 316, 319, 321, 325-329, 331, 334⁸⁸, 335, 341; *see also* dining, meal

θυσιάζω: 80²⁶⁵, 294³⁹⁵

θυσιαστήριον: 80²⁶⁵

θύω: 15, 34, 42, 43, 68, 71, 74, 76, 80²⁰⁵, 85, 88-89, 94, 98-101, 103, 104, 109, 110-111, 118, 119, 126-127, 140, 146-148, 156, 166, 171, 176¹⁹⁵, 180, 186-188, 192, 197-200, 205, 207-212, 219-224, 256²⁰², 265, 287-289, 292-300, 303, 329, 334⁸⁸, 341; *see also* dining, meal

ἱοποιός: 145; *see also* ἱεροποιός

ἱερά

offerings burnt in the altar fire: 53, 139, 140, 145, 220, 222³⁵, 276, 285³⁵⁷, 309, 319⁴²

sacrificial victims: 47, 68, 142, 154

ἄπυρα ἱερά: 32 ἱερεῖον, sacrificial vlctim: 44, 53, 100, 101, 103, 147, 218¹², 229⁶⁸, 254, 256, 259²¹⁷, 270²⁷², 289

ἱερόν: 35, 94, 99, 141, 144, 148-149, 197, 334⁸⁸

ἱεροποιός: 220²⁵, 324; *see also* ἱεροποῖός
ἱερῶσυνα: 142, 320⁴³; *see also* perquisites, meat portion, γέρα
ἱλάσκομαι: 189²⁵⁹, 194 197-198
ἱπνός: 220²⁵
ἱστία: 319⁴²; *see also* ἐστία, hearth
ἱστιάτωρ: 144, 146; *see also* ἐστιάτωρ, host
καθαγίζω: 89²⁹⁴, 109, 201-202, 222³⁵, 223³⁸, 235⁹⁹, 308¹
καθάρματα: 121
καίω: 56¹⁵², 57¹⁵³, 118 καρπό»: 234, 308¹ καταθύω: 109
κατακαίω: 115⁴¹², 119, 219²¹, 221-223, 235, 319⁴¹
καταστέφω: 270
καταστρέφω 271, 276²⁹³
κατασφάζω: 65, 255¹⁹⁵
καταχθόνιοι θεοί: 114; *see also* chthonian divinities
κατέρχομαι: 50
καυτός: 220, 234
κενὸν ἡρίον: 94; *see also* cenotaph
κίστη: 283³⁴¹
κλέος: 233, 264
κλιθείς: 178, 190
κλίνη: 14, 102, 137, 144; *see also* couch
κνίση: 47, 118, 181, 194-195, 242; *see also* smoke
κόπτομαι: 220²⁷
λίπος: 47
μαγειρεῖον: 35; *see also* kitchen
μάγειρος: 244-246, 248¹⁵¹
μάντις: 252
μέγαρα: 46, 49¹²⁶, 61¹⁷⁰, 68, 217⁹, 325
μελίκρατον: 62-63, 66, 75, 104, 237
μερίς: 142; *see also* meat (portions of)
μέτριοι: 141; *see also* metics
μῆρα: 115, 120; *see also* animal bones

μηρία: 201; *see also* animal bones

μίασμα: 121, 227, 230⁷⁵, 265²⁴⁸; *see also* pollution, impurity

μνημα: 88, 94, 99, 107³⁷⁴, 200³¹⁶, 262²³², 263²³⁷

ναός: 38, 94, 319

νηφάλιος: 43, 133, 155, 156, 157, 166, 296⁴⁰¹, 314, 317; *see also* wineless sacrifice

τὰ νομιζόμενα: 87, 106, 197, 204

ξενία: 183²³², 280³²³; *see also* θεοξένια

ξένοι: 37⁸⁰, 316²⁹, 322⁵⁶, 323⁵⁸; *see also* foreigners, outsiders

ὀβελός: 38

οἰκία: 144, 149

οἶκος: 38, 323

ὄλοκαυτέω: 23, 170, 224, 328⁷⁶; *see also* holocaust, destruction sacrifice

ὄλοκαύτησις: 224-225, 226

ὄλόκαυτος: 134, 166, 170, 218, 233-235, 294, 296, 307, 309, 332; *see also* holocaust, destruction sacrifice

ὄλοκαύτωμα: 120

ὀπτάνιον: 144; *see also* kitchen

ὀργεῶνες: 138, 140-141, 144, 148-149, 164, 166, 284, 300

ὄρος: 30, 35, 131⁵, 308

οὐ φορά: 140, 144, 156, 166, 223, 225, 313-325; *see also* prohibition

οὐλοπλάσματα: 68; *see also* cakes

οὐράνιοι θεοί: 112, 270²⁷⁴; *see also* Olympian divinities

πελανός: 43, 139, 148¹⁰³, 179²¹², 202³³⁰

πέμματα: 68; *see also* cakes

περίδειπνον: 231⁸⁰, 278

πίναξ: 145

πλάσματα: 222³³; *see also* cakes

πολυανδρεῖον: 75

πολυάνδριον: 94, 96

πολύθυτος: 119, 183, 194

πομπή: 33-34, 48, 183, 210, 283-284, 290³⁷⁸; *see also* procession
 πόπανα: 104, 106, 139, 148¹⁰³; *see also* cakes
 προβώμως: 32, 41⁹³; *see also* βωμός
 προσφαγιάζω: 256²⁰²
 προσφάγιον: 229-230, 256, 263, 288³⁶⁸
 προσφάζω: 229⁶⁸, 254, 256²⁰⁰
 προσχάραιος θυσία: 31-33
 προτέμνω: 173
 πρότομα: 173-176, 186-188, 190, 258, 261, 266, 294, 296, 305, 309
 προτομή: 174
 πυρά: 173, 186-188; *see also* pyre
 ρυτόν: 39, 174¹⁸⁵
 σέβομαι: 76, 199, 203, 208
 σῆμα: 200-201
 σπένδω: 179²¹³, 186-188, 295; *see also* libation
 σπλάγχνα: 15, 102, 218, 220, 243, 248, 288, 290, 308¹, 318; *see also* animal victim (parts of)
 σποδός: 201, 202³²⁸; *see also* ash
 σπονδή: 119, 179²¹³, 205³⁵²; *see also* libation
 σφαγεῖον: 242-247, 273, 275
 σφαγή: 172-173, 175-176, 186-187, 190, 203, 250, 258, 273²⁸⁵, 294, 296, 305, 309; *see also* blood, blood rituals
 σφάγια: 111, 118, 120, 172-173, 188, 194²⁸⁷, 216, 217⁹, 224⁴⁵, 240¹²⁴, 250, 252-253, 257-261, 264, 268-273, 275, 289, 295³⁹⁹, 305, 325, 327, 327, 329; *see also* battle-line sacrifices, blood rituals
 σφαγιάζω: 23, 250, 261, 271
 σφάζω: 23³, 68²⁰¹, 71, 99, 101, 102, 135²¹, 176, 250, 253, 267, 270-271, 275, 295; *see also* ἀποσφάζω, κατὰσφάζω, προσφάζω, blood rituals
 τάριχος: 178; *see also* fish
 τάφος: 94, 176, 200³¹⁶, 259²¹⁷, 263²³⁶, 270; *see also* burial, grave, tomb
 τέλειον: 138, 139, 140, 144, 145, 141, 150, 152¹²², 158, 221; *see also* animal species (sheep)
 τέμενος: 36, 44¹⁰⁵, 94, 131⁵, 133¹³, 143⁷², 149, 183, 186, 200³¹⁶, 240,

319⁴¹, 321⁴⁹, 323, 334⁸⁸

τέμνω: 173, 271

τιμάω: 98, 179²¹², 186, 197³⁰¹, 199-208, 262, 293; *see also* honouring

τιμή: 76²⁴⁷, 193, 197³⁰¹, 199-206, 208, 258²⁰⁹, 259²¹⁷, 261-262, 293, 334⁸⁸; *see also* honouring

τράπεζα: 47, 130, 137-140, 142, 158-161, 167, 177, 179, 261²²⁸, 281, 284, 286, 288³⁷⁰, 293, 294, 304, 309, 319; *see also* table, θεοξένια

τραπεζώματα: 140, 281, 309, 319, 324; *see also* meat

τρίττοα βόαρχος: 146, 161

τυμβοχοέω: 198³⁰⁸

ὕπολείβω: 235-236

ὕποχθόνιοι θεοί: 46, 61¹⁷⁰, 64, 66, 110, 112; *see also* chthonian divinities

φαρμακός: 195²⁸⁹; *see also* scapegoat

φονή: 175-176, 189-190, 258, 294, 296, 305

χαῖρε: 18¹⁷, 266²⁵⁸

χέρνιψ: 288

χέω: 88, 179²¹³, 210, 259²¹⁷, 267; *see also* libation

χθόνιοι θεοί: 46, 64, 66, 110-111, 135²³, 270²⁷⁴, *see also* chthonian divinities

χοαί: 23, 74, 88, 89, 104, 106, 108, 110, 119-120, 128, 179²¹³, 193, 197, 198³⁰⁸, 210, 254-255; *see also* libation

χοαί ἄοινοί: 42; *see also* wineless sacrifices, νηφάλιος

χύτλα: 120

χῶμα γῆς: 94

ὥς ἦρω: 82, 85, 92, 93, 130, 172, 184-185, 186²⁴³, 198-199, 185²³⁷, 206-212, 296⁴⁰¹, 299, 334⁸⁸

General index

- Academy, Athens: 33, 84; *see also* Akademos, Heroes at the Academy
- Acheloios: 253, 259
- Achilles: 64, 65, 92, 93, 94-95, 254-256, 258²⁰⁸, 260²²¹, 265-266, 285
cult at Troy: 67, 69, 70, 71, 94, 96, 99, 101-102, 103-104, 122-123, 126, 127⁴⁶⁰, 222³⁶, 267
dual character as both god and hero: 71, 99, 101-102, 127, 222³⁶
- Acropolis, Athens: 33, 47¹¹⁴, 145, 176, 189
- Adrastos: 182-183
- Agamedes: 64, 66, 67, 70, 71, 265
- Agamemnon: 180²¹⁵, 256, 285
- Agamemnoneion, Mycenae: 337¹⁰⁰
- Agamemnonidai: 85, 89, 171, 180, 241
- Agathoi: 135-136, 148, 172, 176, 258, 262, 266, 299-300; *see also* war dead on Thasos
- Agathos daimon-. 193²⁷⁸; *see also* daimones
- Aglauros: 144, 156, 324⁶⁷
- agora: 59, 79, 96, 184, 203
- at Athens: 30⁴⁰, 34, 53¹⁴⁰, 136, 170¹⁶³, 231
- Aiakidai: 82, 85, 89, 171, 180, 241
- Aias: 75-77, 92, 96, 99³²⁹, 105, 182, 260²²¹, 298⁴⁰⁵
- Aischylos, worshipped as a hero: 116, 118
- Aitolos: 93
- Akademos, garden of: 66, 68, 69, 70
- Aktaion: 93, 97

Alexander the Great: 18¹⁷, 46, 48, 93, 94 95, 99, 100³³⁵, 105³⁶⁷, 205, 209, 334⁸⁸

Alexanor: 92, 99-100

Alkidamas: 205

Alkmene: 133, 143⁷², 165, 239

Alochos: 162

altar: 14, 15, 16, 23-35, 37, 39, 41-49, 53-59, 80²⁶⁵, 99, 100³³⁷, 103-104, 112, 115⁴¹², 120, 139, 141-142, 143⁷², 145, 147, 166, 173, 176, 181, 182, 186-187, 188, 189, 190-191, 201-202, 204-205, 209, 217, 218, 223⁴², 226⁵⁶, 242-243, 245-247, 249, 250, 252, 257, 260-261, 276, 281, 282, 283, 289²⁷⁷, 297, 298, 308-309, 312, 340¹¹⁸; *see also* βωμός, ἐσχάρα, θυμέλη

ash-altar: 36-38, 48-49, 53, 58-59, 191, 202³²⁸, 308

made of blood: 49

relation bomos-eschara-. 26-27, 31, 41, 42-43, 45-50, 52-54, 58-59

surface or upper part of: 26, 27, 43-44, 47-48, 53, 54-57, 308

Amazons: 47

Ammon, oracle of: 95, 99, 100, 212³⁸⁵

Amorgos: 135²¹, 232⁸⁹, 267²⁶⁰

Amphiaraios: 20²⁵, 75-77, 142, 143, 149¹⁰⁸, 298⁴⁰⁵

Amphiareion at Oropos: 30³⁹, 75-76, 282³³⁹, 320⁴⁷; *see also* Amphiaraios

Amphieraos: 149¹⁰⁸; *see also* Amphiaraios

Amphilochos: 92

Amphion 206; *see also* Amphiones

Amphiones: 194-195

Amphipolis: 118, 172, 176, 184-186, 190, 203, 211, 257-258, 262, 285, 296⁴⁰¹

Amphitrite: 53¹⁴⁰

Amphitryon: 86

Amyklai: 99, 100³³⁷, 103

Amyneion, Athens: 145, 282³³⁹

Amynos: 145, 149, 211³⁷⁸

Anaxagoras: 206

ancestors: 21, 225, 237, 288-289

Andania, mysteries at: 100³³⁵

Andromache: 233

animal bones: 32⁵², 37⁸⁰, 38⁸³, 80, 130, 219, 221³¹, 230-232, 242, 249, 278, 289²⁷⁷, 319⁴¹, 332⁸¹

burnt at sacrifices: 32⁵², 37⁸⁰, 38⁸³, 80, 101, 115, 120, 130, 201-202, 219, 221³¹, 242, 249, 289³⁷⁷, 319⁴¹

holocausted: 80

debris from dining: 37⁸⁰, 221³¹, 232⁸⁸

in funerary context: 230-232, 278

astragaloi: 231

ribs: 231⁷⁹

skull: 231⁷⁹, 289³⁷⁷

teeth: 231⁸¹

thigh-bones: 101, 115, 120, 201-202, 230⁷⁷

animal species; *see also* ἱερεῖον, τέλειον

bird: 41, 308¹, 327⁷³

boar: 255

bull: 33, 67, 68²⁰¹, 71, 78, 79, 80-82, 99, 100³³⁸, 101, 102, 103, 118, 136³¹, 150, 176, 189²⁵⁹, 217¹⁰, 220²⁷, 224, 226, 227, 243¹³⁵, 249¹⁵⁶, 260²²⁰⁻²²¹, 267, 276²⁹³, 308¹,

calf: 231⁷⁹

cattle: 32, 134, 158, 166-167, 175, 189, 231⁸¹, 249^{153,156}

cow: 62, 138, 152¹²³, 158-162, 164-165, 167, 168, 194, 231⁷⁹, 247, 276²⁹³

dog: 41, 228⁶⁵, 231, 231^{81,85}, 255, 284

ewe: 62, 65, 68-69, 158, 160, 161¹³⁹, 162, 164, 166, 168, 174, 254

goat: 61, 103, 113, 128, 133, 141, 143, 146, 152¹²², 157-162, 164, 165, 168, 221²⁹, 223, 227, 230⁷⁶, 231^{79,81}, 239, 240¹²⁴, 252¹⁷², 255, 259²¹⁵, 324

heifer: 319

horse: 47, 97³²³, 103, 176, 217¹⁰, 228⁶⁵, 231, 231⁸⁵, 255, 261²²³, 284
kid: 109, 139, 152¹²², 158, 159, 162, 168

lamb: 101, 103, 109, 112, 128, 133, 134, 142⁶⁸, 150, 158, 159, 162, 168,

220, 231⁷⁹, 252¹⁷², 252, 308¹

mare: 261

mule: 231⁸⁵

ox: 47, 103, 104, 128, 133, 140⁵⁸, 143, 158-168, 172-173, 174¹⁸⁶, 186-187, 189, 218, 220, 227, 228-229, 232, 237, 238¹¹¹, 239, 249¹⁵⁵, 255, 258, 267, 274, 308¹, 322⁵⁴

pig: 134, 143, 146, 152¹²², 160-162, 164, 165, 167, 168, 227, 231^{79,8\} 232, 244, 251, 274²⁸⁷, 281, 308¹, 325

piglet: 60-61, 133, 134, 138, 141, 143⁷², 154¹²⁸, 158-168, 217⁹, 218-219, 221²⁹, 224, 226, 227, 234⁹⁵, 237, 239, 243-244, 251, 281, 289³⁷⁶, 292, 308¹

puppies: 65, 69, 325

ram: 37⁸⁰, 62, 67, 68, 71, 100, 103, 114⁴⁰⁷, 128, 134²⁰, 135²¹, 146, 147, 150, 160-162, 168, 174-175, 189²⁵⁹, 192²⁷⁴, 219, 220²⁷, 237, 244, 252¹⁷⁵, 254, 260, 265, 267²⁶⁰, 271, 273²⁸², 319⁴¹, 322⁵⁴, 327⁷³, 332⁸¹

sheep: 37⁸⁰, 38⁸³, 42, 44, 47, 61, 62, 65, 67¹⁹⁴, 95, 103, 128, 133, 134, 138, 139, 140-141, 143, 145-147, 152^{122,123}, 158-168, 174, 175, 194, 218-221, 227, 228, 230-232, 238-239, 253, 255, 270, 271, 288³⁷⁰, 308¹, 332⁸¹

snake: 284, 315-316

wether: 134²⁰, 160, 162, 164, 168

wolf: 231⁸⁵

animal victim; *see also* animal bones, animal species ἱερεῖον, τέλειον;
animal victim (treatment of)

god's portion at sacrifice: 42, 115, 120, 130, 178, 180, 182, 199³¹³, 202, 240¹²⁴, 242, 287-288, 290, 318, 328

hero's portion at sacrifice: 16, 179²⁰⁹, 180, 181-182, 185, 202

prices and financial considerations: 134-135, 146, 152-153, 158-164, 284-285, 292, 304

parts of; *see also* meat

bile: 176¹⁹⁶, 249, 250¹⁶⁰

bones; *see* animal bones

ears: 250¹⁶⁰

feet: 103, 225⁴⁷

gall-bladder: 130, 308¹

head: 14, 62¹⁷⁸, 140, 174-176, 188, 231⁷⁹, 252¹⁷⁵, 269-276, 289³⁷, 297, 305, 312

hide: 134, 152, 157, 224, 225⁴⁷, 249; *see also* skin

horn 250¹⁶⁰, 272, 289³⁷⁷

intestines: 15, 65, 217, 218, 242, 247-248, 252, 319; *see also* σπλάγχνα

leg: 134, 142-143, 217, 219²², 231⁷⁹, 237, 289³⁷⁶, 319⁴¹

muzzle: 272-273

neck: 174, 192²⁷²

rind: 134¹⁹

shoulder: 142, 220²⁷

animal victim, parts of (*continued*)

skin: 134, 140, 142-143, 144, 146, 157, 169, 217, 223, 225, 227, 265, 319⁴², 320⁴³; *see also* hide

stomach: 65, 69, 247

tail: 250¹⁶⁰, 308¹

testicles: 252¹⁷¹

thigh: 140, 219, 316, 319⁴¹, 332⁸¹

tongue: 143⁷⁵, 174¹⁸⁶, 217¹⁰, 225⁴⁷

animal victim, treatment of burning

of entire victim: 14, 27, 60, 61, 63, 68-69, 75, 80-81, 101-102, 112, 119, 128, 129, 133-134, 155, 165, 179²⁰⁹, 216, 217-218, 224-225, 234-235, 238, 251, 255, 256, 270, 276, 290, 291, 308-309, 327-328, 332, 341; *see also* destruction sacrifice, holocaust

of a part or parts of the victim: 216, 217-218, 220-226, 235-237, 252¹⁷², 277, 285³⁵⁷, 288³⁷⁰, 308, 316, 319⁴¹, 332⁸¹; *see also* "moirocaust"

of a ninth of the meat: 220-223, 235-237; *see also* ἐνατεύω

of divinity's portion: 15, 16, 42, 53, 101, 103, 112, 115, 118, 120, 130, 139, 140, 145, 178, 180-182, 185, 201-202, 217-218, 240¹²⁴, 242, 285³⁵⁷, 289, 290, 318, 328

castrated: 134²⁰, 160, 325; *see also* wether

decapitated: 62¹⁷⁸, 174-176, 188, 271, 275

flayed: 63, 134, 143, 269

killed with head bent towards the ground: 14, 269-276, 297, 305, 312
singed: 134, 143

skin destroyed: 156, 157, 217, 223, 225, 227

throat cut, slit or pierced: 14, 65, 68, 135, 172-174, 184-185, 243,
252¹⁷⁵, 260²²¹, 269-275

Anios: 36-37, 282³³⁹, 323⁵⁸; *see also* Heros Archegetes

anonymous, heroes or heroines: 138, 139, 143, 150, 161, 337⁹⁹

Antenoridai: 117, 119, 177, 203³³⁸

Anthesteria: 114, 136, 268²⁶⁶, 278-279

Antilochos: 92, 96, 99³²⁹

antiquarian tendencies: 122-123, 307-308

Antisara, *see* Hero at Antisara

Apatouria: 136

Aphrodite: 31, 46, 48, 55¹⁵⁰, 139

Apollon: 29, 40, 41-42, 43-44, 55¹⁴⁹, 61, 70²²¹, 73, 99, 100, 103, 131⁵,
156, 183, 192, 198³⁰⁴, 201, 247, 249¹⁵⁰, 251, 265²⁵², 269, 277, 285, 314,
324, 334⁸⁷, 338¹⁰⁴

Apotropaia: 156

Dalios: 321⁵⁰, 322

Hekatombios: 220²⁷

Karneios: 177

Lykeios: 156

Patroos: 155¹²²

Pythios: 46, 48, 139⁴⁸, 156, 226⁵⁶, 321⁵⁰

Soter: 194-195

apotropaic rituals: 267²⁰², 276, 295

appeasement: 88, 91, 97, 98, 198, 264, 279³¹⁵, 333⁸²; *see also* expiation,
placation, propitiation

Archegesion, Delos: 36-39, 57-59, 282³³⁹, 308

Archegetes, *see* Heros Archegetes, ἀρχηγέτης

Archilochos: 199³¹¹, 205-206

Ares: 46, 47

Arge: 201-202, 298⁴⁰⁵; *see also* Hyperborean maidens

Argolid: 308¹, 337⁹⁸

Argonaute: 47, 65, 270

Argos: 59, 68, 70, 100³³⁷, 131⁴, 174¹⁸⁶, 205, 219²², 249¹⁵⁶, 265²⁵², 340¹¹³

Aristogeiton: 66¹⁸⁶, 82, 83-85, 88, 96³¹⁰, 123⁴⁴⁶, 170-171, 179²¹³, 241¹³⁰

Aristomenes: 79, 81, 82, 93, 103

Aristonidas: 79, 81, 82

army 96, 173-174, 188, 198³⁰⁸, 224, 226, 251, 252-253, 264, 327⁷³, 338

Artachaies: 198, 208-209, 211

Artemis: 46, 48, 96, 146, 156, 157, 194-195, 201-202, 217, 223, 225, 236, 292³⁸⁸, 314, 321⁴⁹, 331⁷⁷

Agrotera: 83, 240¹²⁴, 259²¹⁵

Laphria: 125⁴⁵⁴

ash: 28³³, 30, 32⁵², 35, 49, 58-59, 80, 201-202, 231, 249; *see also* ash-altar

Asklepieion, Athens: 226⁵⁵

Asklepieion, Epidauros: 226⁵⁵

Asklepios: 16¹⁴, 21, 60, 67, 100, 145, 149, 211³⁷⁸, 224-227, 264²³⁹, 308¹, 323, 331

Assyria, heroes of: 194

Athena: 32-33, 35, 37, 42, 100³³⁷, 156, 172, 175, 186, 189, 203, 258, 277, 314

Apotropaia: 320⁴⁷, 323

Hellotis: 161

Hypate: 194

Polias: 44

Skiras: 166, 298⁴⁰⁵, 334⁸⁷

Athens: 21²⁸, 28, 33-34, 37, 44, 47, 55¹⁵⁰, 70, 76²⁴⁴, 77, 97, 122, 131, 132, 133, 165, 168, 170, 184, 186, 188, 197, 204, 226-227, 229, 239, 255, 256, 261-262, 279³¹⁷, 288³⁶⁸, 320⁴⁷

athletes: 252¹⁷²

worshipped as heroes: 21²⁸, 97³²⁰, 197-198, 211³⁸⁴, 335⁸⁹

athletic contests: 13, 83, 197, 199, 221²⁹, 333; *see also* games, funeral games

Atreidai: 82, 85, 89, 171, 180, 241

Attica: 19²¹, 29-30, 33, 37, 49, 57, 131-132, 133, 134, 142, 151, 167¹⁵⁶, 169, 170, 228, 237, 239, 254, 256, 321, 323, 335⁸⁹, 337⁹⁸

Augeas: 93

aversion: 43, 251, 264, 279³¹⁵, 326, 340

Babylon: 95, 176

banqueting hero-relief: 37⁸⁰, 137, 229, 261²²³, 279, 282-284, 286

barley: 62, 101, 140, 145, 220, 269; *see also* grain

cake made of barley: 281

Basile: 133-134, 156, 239-240

battle-line or pre-battle sacrifices: 103³⁵⁰, 114, 127, 128, 172-174, 188, 217⁹, 240¹²⁴, 251, 252-253, 259-261, 264, 268, 275, 289, 305, 329; *see also* σφάγια, war

Battos: 119, 177, 203, 263

black animal victim, *see* colour

Black goddesses: 110, 111, 222³⁶

Blood

and purification: 114, 233⁹⁴, 251, 253, 259, 263-265, 305, 327, 329

and war: 114, 135, 172-175, 187-188, 224⁴⁵, 252-253, 257-262, 268, 271-274, 305, 327, 329; *see also* battle-line sacrifices, σφάγια

consumed raw: 249¹⁵⁶, 285

drunk: 63, 102, 118, 178, 265, 266, 267, 285

human blood: 109

kept, prepared and consumed: 245-251, 285, 309

on the altar: 49, 112, 217, 242-247, 249, 250, 257, 288

poured into bothros or pit: 14, 16, 27, 60-63, 65, 67-71, 73, 101, 102, 120, 128, 173-174, 176, 226⁵⁵, 271, 274-276, 297, 306

poured on the hero's tomb: 14, 136, 176, 185, 236¹⁰⁴, 276, 300

use in the cult of the dead: 254-257, 265-268, 285-286, 306; *see also* προσφάγιον

used as a libation: 75, 80²⁶⁵, 104, 118, 120, 129, 136, 169, 178, 189, 190-191, 217, 253, 256-26, 312; *see also* αἱμαουρία

used as an invitation 266-268, 285-286, 306, 329; *see also* θεοξένια

blood rituals: 15, 20, 129-130, 135-136, 148, 169, 171-177, 178, 182,

184-192, 207, 212-213, 215, 242-276, 289, 291, 293, 296⁴⁰¹, 298-301, 305-306, 309-310, 312, 325, 327, 328, 329, 332, 341; *see also* αἱμακουρία, ἐντέμνω, σφαγή, σφάγια, σφάζω, φονή

bloodless sacrifices or offerings: 13, 15, 16, 32, 37, 102, 108, 130, 139, 148¹⁰³, 199-200, 277³⁰¹, 283; *see also* cakes, fruit, vegetables

bones, *see* animal bones of hero: 79, 94, 198, 211

Boubrostis: 217, 224, 226, 228, 329

Brasidas: 118, 172, 176, 184-186, 190, 203, 208-209, 211, 257-258, 262, 266, 285, 296⁴⁰¹

Braurom 28²⁹, 202

brazier: 25-26, 28-29

bread: 13, 15, 139, 179²⁰⁹, 279, 309, 319

burial: 63, 79-80, 82, 84²⁷⁷, 91, 94-97, 100, 103-104, 114, 126, 176, 185, 188²⁵³, 197, 200³¹⁶, 204, 206, 211, 228-233, 235, 254, 256, 263; *see also* grave, tomb, τάφος

burial mound: 67, 69, 70, 71, 99, 101, 191, 198, 267, 276, 278-279, 305, 334⁸⁸, 335-337

Byzantine literary sources: 24-25, 45¹¹⁰, 303, 309, 310; *see also* grammarians, lexicographers, scholia

Byzantine period: 250

Byzantion: 79

cakes: 13, 15, 16, 68, 103³⁴⁹, 128, 130, 139, 196, 202³³⁰, 220²⁵, 222, 225, 228, 234, 256²⁰³, 276-278, 281, 283, 309

calling of recipient at sacrificial ritual: 67, 71, 73, 265-268, 306; *see also* evocation, invitation

Carthage: 109

Carthaginian sacrificial rituals: 90, 91; *see also* non-Greek rituals

castration of animal victim: 134²⁰, 160, 325; *see also* animal species (wether)

uncastrated animals: 161

cauldron: 39, 192

cave: 18¹⁶, 46, 70²²¹, 80²⁶⁵, 337¹⁰⁰

cenotaph: 84²⁷⁷, 333, 337; *see also* κενὸν ἡρίον

character of recipient, decisive of choice of ritual: 20, 42, 85, 86, 99,

111³⁸⁷, 127, 215-216, 222³⁶, 225-226, 227, 235, 237-242, 268, 277, 284³⁴⁹, 298, 304, 307, 311-318, 325-326, 329-333, 335, 341; *see also* situation, Achilles, Herakles

Charites: 20, 146, 217, 223, 227, 236, 252¹⁷²

Charon: 66, 106, 338¹⁰⁴

cheese: 220, 247, 281

children: 88, 135, 258; *see also* daughters

of Antenor; *see* Antenoridai

of Herakles and Megara: 117, 118, 181

of Kaphyai: 93, 96

of Medea: 93, 97, 113, 115, 117⁴¹³, 123

of Oidipous: 93

of Polyeidōs: 116, 118⁴¹⁹

Christian evidence and context: 17, 60, 110, 111, 170¹⁵⁹, 193²⁷⁸, 250, 292; *see also* non-Greek rituals

Chrysos: 92, 95, 96

chthonian, *see also* Olympian, underworld divinities: 26, 35, 46, 47¹¹¹, 60, 66, 110-111, 112, 114⁴⁰⁴, 135²³, 193, 215, 225-226, 263²³⁷, 269-271, 297-298, 310-318, 325-326, 328, 330, 341; *see also* χθόνιοι, θεοί, ἐπιχθόνιοι, θεοί, καταχθόνιοι, θεοί, ὑποχθόνιοι, θεοί

rituals: 16-17, 27, 35, 53¹⁴⁰, 60, 114⁴⁰⁴, 133, 141, 143⁷⁶, 150, 202³²⁷, 215-216, 225-226, 269-271, 275²⁹⁰, 297⁴⁰², 310-318, 322, 325-326, 328, 330, 341

Chytroi: 278; *see also* Anthesteria

city-state, *see* polis

clothes: 118, 124⁴⁵⁰, 179, 202, 204, 228, 232-233

colonies: 131, 132, 231, 339-340; *see also* oikist

colour

colour of animal victim: 133, 312

black: 61, 62, 65, 81, 99, 101, 102, 103, 113, 133, 192²⁷⁴, 224, 254, 255, 267, 271, 312, 316²⁹, 325

white: 97³²³, 101, 133

offerings coloured black: 109

white clothing: 334⁸⁸

comedy as source of sacrificial rituals: 19, 88, 255¹⁹⁴

cooking pit: 53

cooking pots: 28, 39

Corinth: 113, 131⁵, 231, 282³³⁹, 335⁸⁹

couch: 14, 31, 38, 130, 136-137, 139, 144, 277-278, 281; *see also* κλίνη

cremation rites: 240¹²⁴

crisis, ritual response to: 226-227, 317, 325; *see also* situation

crops: 33, 226, 241, 253

curse-tablets: 333

Cyprus: 132⁹, 149¹⁰⁹, 198

Daidala: 29³⁶

daimones: 20²³, 40, 42, 43, 45¹⁰⁹, 110, 111, 192-193, 195, 212, 334⁸⁷

Daites: 339¹⁰⁸

daughters: 135

of Erechtheus: 172, 186-188, 258, 266, 296⁴⁰¹; *see also* Hyakinthids of Skedasos: 93, 97, 261, 270

dead

cult of the dead: 14, 20, 23, 50, 66, 71-72, 74, 77, 79-80, 82, 86-91, 100, 104-111, 114, 118, 121-122, 126, 128, 130, 177²⁰¹, 181²²⁰, 197, 204, 210, 215, 228-235, 239, 240, 241¹³⁰, 254-257, 263, 267-268, 276-280, 282, 285-286, 288-289, 296, 301, 303-307, 329-341

feeding the dead: 228⁶⁷, 233, 286³⁶⁰, 289

libations to the dead 88-89, 104, 119, 120, 128, 130, 228, 234, 256²⁰³, 278, 286³⁶⁰

offerings to the dead: 21, 74, 104-106, 108-109, 110, 114, 118-120, 128, 193, 194-195, 228-235, 241, 254-257,

dead (*continued*)

offerings to the dead (*continued*): 265 -268, 277-281, 286, 288-289, 301, 329, 332, 335-337; *see also* meals

offerings to the dead destroyed by burning: 66, 69, 105, 228-235, 254, 256, 278, 280, 289, 307; *see also* ἐναγίζω, ἐνάγισμα, ἐναγισμός

deification: 18¹⁷

Delichos 147⁹⁹

Delos: 28-29, 36-39, 54, 56¹⁵², 57¹⁵³, 58, 60-61, 114, 178²⁰⁸, 200-202, 282³³⁹, 298⁴⁰⁵, 308, 323⁵⁸

Delphi: 39⁹⁰, 42, 43-44, 83, 95, 96, 100, 119, 132⁹, 183, 194, 211-212, 257²⁰⁴, 277, 285, 331, 338¹⁰⁴; *see also* Heroes at Delphi

demes of Attica: 133, 138⁴⁴, 139, 141-142, 147-148, 151, 154, 158-163, 166-169, 240, 292, 316, 320, 321; *see also* Eleusis, Erchia, Kollytos, Marathon, Oinoe, Paiania, Probalinthos, Teithras, Thorikos, Trikorynthos, sacrificial calendars

Demeter: 40, 41-42, 44, 49¹²⁶, 61¹⁷⁰, 68, 138⁴⁵, 147, 160¹³⁸, 217⁹, 263, 334⁸⁷

Chloe: 220²⁷

Demophon: 147⁹⁹

Demosion Sema: 84

destruction sacrifice: 14, 20, 133-135, 170-171, 197, 212-213, 215-242, 254, 285, 289-290, 291-292, 293, 295-301, 307-309, 312-313, 316-317, 325-329, 332-333, 341; *see also* ἐναγίζω, ἐνάγισμα, ἐναγισμός

total destruction of animal victim: 14, 16, 70, 75, 101, 113, 129, 153-154, 171, 206-207, 216, 217-229, 238-242, 251-252, 256, 309, 312-313, 316-317, 325, 328-329, 332, 341; *see also* holocaust

partial destruction of animal victim: 216, 217-228, 235-242, 252¹⁷², 259, 277, 309, 313, 316-318, 325, 327, 328-329, 332, 341; *see also* “moirocaust”, ἐνατεύω

destruction of animal victim by fire: 14, 61, 63, 68-69, 75, 80, 101-102, 111-113, 128, 129, 133-134, 155, 216, 217-242, 251, 252¹⁷², 255, 256, 270, 291, 308-309, 327-328, 332, 341

destruction of other kinds of offerings by fire: 66, 69, 75, 89²⁹⁴, 103³⁴⁹, 105, 111, 113, 115, 119, 120, 127, 128, 139, 140, 145, 181, 224-225, 233-235, 255, 276, 277, 278, 280, 285³⁵⁷, 319, 332

in the cult of the dead: 66, 69, 105, 228-235, 254, 256, 278, 280, 289, 307

Dexion 145, 149, 211³⁷⁸

Didyma: 49¹²³

dining: 28

in connection with sacrifice/*thysia* sacrifice: 15, 20, 30, 34, 38, 67, 68, 71, 73, 76, 83²⁷², 85, 87²⁸⁸, 101, 112-113, 123, 129, 130, 137, 140-169, 171, 175, 179-199, 203, 207, 210³⁷⁵, 212, 215, 217-221, 223-224, 227, 253, 259, 287-301, 303-305, 309, 313-324, 329, 335, 339, 341

sacrifices not followed by dining: 43, 70, 72, 83²⁷², 85, 89, 102-103, 108, 112-113, 120, 129, 133-134, 170-171, 206-207, 217-242, 251-254, 280, 305-309, 327-329

dining-room: 38-39, 144, 201, 221³¹, 280, 300, 315; *see also* ἑστιατόριον

Dinka, sacrifices among: 327⁷³, 328⁷⁶

Dioklos: 147, 334⁸⁷

Dionysia: 33-34, 136

Dionysos: 31, 32⁵¹, 33-34, 37, 61¹⁷², 75, 92, 98, 100³³⁵, 139, 142, 143, 144⁸⁵, 152¹²², 156, 157, 183, 188, 277, 283, 296⁴⁰¹, 298⁴⁰⁵, 314, 331, 334⁸⁷

Bakcheus: 324

Eleuthereus: 33

Lenaïos: 34⁶³

Leneus: 316²⁹

Dioskourion, Delos : 36, 38-39

Dioskouroi: 21, 37, 177²⁰¹, 205, 277, 281

Dipoleia: 227

disease: 69, 222³⁴, 317; *see also* plague

Dodona: 148, 212³⁸⁵

Dolops: 118, 270

Drakon, laws of: 179²¹², 202³³⁰

drinking cups: 38, 179²⁰⁹, 222, 255¹⁹⁰

drowning: 82, 96, 253¹⁸¹

earth: 21²⁶, 67, 97, 176, 179, 198, 202, 225, 269, 311, 314, 322; *see also* chthonian

Echelos: 138, 141, 298⁴⁰⁵

Echetlos: 261²²⁴

egg: 231, 251

Egretes: 21²⁸, 144, 148-149, 211³⁷⁸, 300

Egypt: 107³⁷⁴, 109, 111, 149¹⁰⁹

Egyptian sacrificial rituals: 63¹⁷⁹, 90, 91, 109-110, 111; *see also* non-Greek rituals

Eileithyiaia: 178²⁰⁸

Eleusinia: 147⁹⁷

Eleusinos: 147⁹⁹

Eleusis: 44, 59¹⁵⁹, 61¹⁷⁰, 146-147, 148¹⁴⁶

mysteries at Eleusis: 147⁹⁷, 217⁹

sacrificial calendar from deme: 151

Eleusis, hero: 147⁹⁹

enemy: 71, 102, 109, 184, 186-188, 258, 261, 267²⁶⁴

worshipped as hero: 198, 335⁸⁹

entertaining: 285, 304; *see also* θεοξένια

Enyalios: 83, 258²⁰⁸, 325

Epaminondas: 97

ephebeia, Athens : 77

ephebes: 33-35, 75-77

Epidauros: 29, 217, 226

Epikouros: 105

Epikteta, testament of: 179²⁰⁹, 232⁸⁹ 280³²⁵; *see also* foundations of private cults

Epitaphia: 84^{275,277}

Eponymous heroes: 137³²

Epops: 133, 156, 162, 239-241

Erchia, sacrificial calendar from deme: 30, 130, 133, 134, 141, 143, 147, 148, 151-153, 155-157, 161-163, 166-168, 223, 224, 239-241, 260²¹⁸, 288³⁷⁰, 313, 319-322, 324

Erechtheiom 176, 189

Erechtheus: 150, 172, 175-176, 186, 188-190, 258

Eretria, West Gate heroon-. 336⁹²

Erinyes: 40, 42, 43

Eros: 139

Erotes: 46, 48

Etruscan sacrificial rituals: 83, 239; *see also* non-Greek rituals

Euamerion: 99-100

Eubouleus: 147

euergetism: 18¹⁷

Eumaios: 28²⁸, 39, 220²⁷, 281

Eumenides: 43⁹⁷, 222-223

Eumolpos: 147, 334⁸⁷

Euphron of Sikyom 203, 209, 211

Eurypylos: 93, 100³³⁵

Eurysakeion, Athens: 134, 165

Eurysakes: 134, 152¹²², 165, 167

Eurystheus: 255

Eurytos: 93, 100³³⁵

evocation of recipient at sacrificial ritual: 63, 65, 265-266; *see also* calling, invitation

expiation: 127; *see also* appeasement, placation, propitiation

fat: 47, 112, 130, 242, 247, 249; *see also* κνίση, λίπος

female animal victims: 133, 161, 162, 168

female genitalia: 25, 54

fertility: 217⁹, 225, 250¹⁶⁰

fire: 25-26, 29, 36, 39, 43, 45, 47-48, 53-57, 59, 61, 62, 65, 80, 89²⁹⁴, 104, 105, 113-114, 115⁴¹², 128, 139, 170, 173, 196, 216, 217, 219, 220, 224⁴⁵, 247, 248, 252, 308

on the altar/sacrificial fire: 54-57, 120, 139-140, 145, 180, 181-182, 187, 188, 220²⁵, 242-243, 282, 287, 314

fire rituals: 238

fish: 25¹⁰, 88, 178-179, 245¹⁴⁰, 248¹⁴⁶

flour: 112, 245

food, offerings of: 15, 16, 31, 89, 102, 104-105, 108-109, 128, 130, 136-137, 139-140, 169, 178-179, 222, 228-233, 234, 276-286, 305; *see also* θεοξένια, meal, table, τράπεζα

foreigners: 77, 291, 322; *see also* outsiders, ξένοι

foundations of private cults: 18¹⁷, 31, 79, 135²¹, 137³³, 178²⁰⁹, 232⁸⁹, 267²⁶⁰

Diomedon, Kos: 31, 137³³, 179²⁰⁹, 232⁸⁹

Epikteta, Thera: 179²⁰⁹, 232⁸⁹, 280³²⁵

Kritolaos, Amorgos: 135²¹, 232⁸⁹, 267²⁶⁰

frankincense: 48, 61, 111

fruit: 13, 15, 16, 114⁴⁰⁸, 128, 130, 139, 179, 196, 202, 204, 234, 276, 281, 309

funeral: 135, 198, 204, 206, 228-230, 240¹²⁴, 254-255, 262, 263, 278, 280, 288³⁶⁶, 289; *see also* pyre

funeral games: 83-84, 105, 135-136, 170, 172, 197, 204, 241, 333

funerary laws: 202³³¹, 229-230, 256-257, 307, 335, 339

games: 175, 181-182, 184-185, 203, 239, 262²³², 266-267, 268, 306; *see also* athletic contests, funeral games

garland: 101, 149, 181, 270; *see also* wreath

Ge: 49¹²³, 152¹²², 156, 194, 176, 268²⁶⁶, 279³¹⁶, 315

Chthonie: 316²⁹, 321⁵⁰, 322

Olympia: 46, 47

Genesis: 84²⁷⁵, 240, 268²⁶⁶, 279

Geometrie period: 31⁴⁸, 231, 232⁸⁸, 337-338, 340¹¹⁸; *see also* Iron Age

ghosts: 21²⁶, 232, 255, 279³¹⁵, 317; *see also* souls of the dead

Glaukos: 150, 248

Golden Fleece: 65, 67, 692²¹⁴

grain: 130, 139, 276, 327⁷³; *see also* barley, wheat

grammarians: 310; *see also* Byzantine literary sources, lexicographers, scholia

grating: 25, 29, 48¹¹⁷

grave: 60, 69, 84²⁷⁷, 87-88, 105-106, 110,

114, 128, 228-233, 235, 254-256, 263, 278, 280, 288, 331, 340; *see also* burial, tomb, τάφος

of hero: 19, 70, 79, 82, 88, 95-97, 107, 118, 126, 184, 188²⁵³, 198³⁰⁸, 207, 259²¹⁷, 330, 335-338

gravestone: 18¹⁸, 22³⁰, 102, 104, 132⁷, 229⁷⁰, 263²³⁷, 279, 339¹¹³

grief: 105, 233, 289

grill: 28, 31, 35, 137, 248; *see also* ἐσχάρα

Hades: 61, 62-63, 106, 202, 254, 330, 331

Hagnon 184-185, 203, 211, 258²⁰⁹

hair: 120, 200-202, 206³⁵⁸, 255

Haloa: 44

Harmodios: 66¹⁸⁶, 82, 83-85, 88, 96³¹⁰, 115, 117⁴¹³, 123⁴⁴⁶, 170-171, 179²¹³, 241¹³⁰

head, *see also* animal victim (parts of)

head of Onesilos: 198

head of Orpheus: 334⁸⁸

hearth: 14, 25-29, 35, 36, 39, 42⁹⁷, 48-49, 53-54, 58-59, 308, 319; *see also* ἐστία, ἐσχάρα

heavenly gods: 50, 113⁴⁰², 179²¹³, 270; *see also* Olympian divinities

Hebe: 31

Hebrew sacrificial rituals: 90, 91, 110, 112, 123⁴⁴⁴, 170¹⁵⁹, 328⁷⁶; *see also* Israelite sacrificial rituals, non-Greek rituals

hecatomb: 42, 100³³⁵, 103, 175, 188²⁵³

heilige Handlungen-. 216, 317, 325-328, 341

Hekabe: 255

Hekate: 64, 65 -67, 69, 135²³, 265, 267²⁶², 276, 285³⁵⁷

Hektor: 233, 260²²¹

Helen 18¹⁶, 149¹⁰⁸, 205, 208, 209, 211³⁸³

Heliodoros and sacrificial ritual: 91, 103, 109, 111, 114, 119⁴²⁴, 122

Helios: 176, 2 10³⁷⁵, 21 7¹⁰, 315

Hellotion, *see* Hero at Hellotion

Hephaestion: 92, 95, 99, 100, 105³⁰⁷, 205, 208, 209

Hera: 31, 48-49, 55, 152¹²², 156, 219²², 314, 319

Akraia: 110, 113

Thelchinia: 156, 240¹²⁵

Herakleidai: 29-30, 35, 37, 57, 144, 156, 158¹³⁴, 298⁴⁰⁵, 308, 324⁶⁷

Herakleion

at Porthmos, Sounion: 142-143, 164-165, 238

onThasos: 221, 315²²

Herakles: 31, 32⁵¹, 67, 68, 70, 71, 82, 88, 92, 100, 103, 133, 136³¹, 139⁴⁸, 142-143, 165, 176¹⁹⁵, 180²¹⁵, 181-182, 191²⁷¹, 194-195, 208-209, 211³⁸³, 217, 223, 237, 240¹²⁴, 261, 277, 282, 283, 289^{374,377}, 290³⁷⁸, 313, 329; *see also* children of Herakles and Megara

dual character as both god and hero: 16¹⁴, 21, 85-86, 89, 98-99, 101, 127, 171, 208, 219-221, 225-227, 238-239, 297, 331, 333

death of: 86, 88, 238, 240¹²⁴, 290²³⁸

Phoenician origin 86

Diomedonteios: 31, 137³³

Thasios: 221

Hermes: 100³³⁷, 217¹⁰, 247, 278, 281

Enagonios: 146

Hero at Antisara: 133, 143⁷², 165, 239

Hero at Hellotion: 138, 161

Hero at Pyrgiliom 133, 143⁷², 165, 239

Hero at -rasileia-. 138, 161

Hero at the Haie: 133-134, 142, 165, 239

Hero -nechos-. 161, 163, 166-167

Heroes at the Academy: 64, 70, 94, 96³¹⁰

Heroes at Delphi: 117, 119, 183

Heroes at Phigaleia: 189²⁵⁷

Heroes at Plataiai: 205³⁵²

Heroes fallen at Troy: 94, 96, 99³²⁹, 179²¹³

Heroes in the field: 150

Heroes of Salamis: 258²⁰⁸

Heroines at Pylom 143, 144, 156, 162

Heroïnes at Schoinos: 143, 144, 156, 162

Heroines of Echelos: 138, 140-141

Heroines of Hyperpedios: 138⁴⁵, 159

Heroines of Pylouchos: 138⁴⁵

Heroines of the Hero at Hellotion: 161

Heroines of Thorikos: 138⁴⁵

heroization: 18, 76²⁴⁸, 132⁷, 135²¹, 145⁸⁸, 208³⁶⁷, 308, 338¹⁰⁷

Heros Archegetes, *see also* ἀρχηγέτης

Athens: 143⁷⁵, 194-195

Delos: 36-39, 57-58, 323⁵⁸; *see also* Anios

Eleusis: 147, 334⁸⁷

Mykonos: 322

Rhamnous: 149¹⁰⁸, 167¹⁵⁷

Tronis: 236¹⁰⁴, 259²¹⁷, 323⁵⁸

Heros Iatros: 21²⁸, 149¹⁰⁷, 211³⁷⁸

Hestia Hetaireia: 218¹²

Hippodameia: 96

suitors of Hippodameia: 93, 96

Hippokrates, worshipped as hero: 92, 104, 105, 123

Hippolytos: 139, 201³²⁴, 206, 331⁷⁷

Hippothoom 147⁹⁹

holocaust: 14,16, 58, 68-69, 75,80,100³³⁸ 111-113, 115⁴¹², 119, 124-125, 127 129, 133-134, 147, 148, 150, 154-157 165, 169, 176, 216, 217-242, 251¹⁶⁷ 289-290, 295-296, 299-300, 308-310 313-316, 321, 322⁵³, 325, 328-329 333⁸²; *see also* ὀλοκαυτος, ὀλοκαυτέω: destruction
sacrifice, ἐναγίζω, ἐνάγισμα, ἐναγισμός

Homer

and hero-cult: 22³⁰, 337¹⁰¹, 338

and sacrificial rituals: 62-63, 65, 71, 72-73, 195²⁸⁹, 199³¹³, 244¹³⁷, 255, 269-270, 271, 273²⁸⁶, 274-275, 281, 306

worshipped as hero: 206

Homonoia: 289

honey: 65, 67, 70, 109, 173, 187-188, 198, 220, 221, 254, 278, 325

honouring in the sense of receiving cult: 76, 77, 95, 99, 119,172,181,183,184-187, 197, 199-206, 208-212, 239¹¹⁴, 258, 259²¹⁷, 262, 284, 293-294, 299, 300, 303, 334⁸⁸, 337, 339¹⁰⁸

horse-races: 13, 83,170,197,199, 204, 239, 266

host: 140-141, 144, 146, 278

human sacrifice: 95³⁰⁸, 103, 105, 111, 127, 128, 228⁶⁵, 255, 256^{1"}, 257, 275²⁸⁹, 295

hunt: 292

Hyakinthids: 172-173, 175-176, 186-190, 203, 258, 261 ; *see also* daughters of Erechtheus

Hyakinthos: 92, 99, 100³³⁷, 103, 334⁸⁷

Hygieia: 323

Hyperborean maidens: 200-202; *see also* Arge, Hyperoche, Laodike, Opis

Hyperoche: 200-201; *see also* Hyperborean maidens

Hyperpedios: 138⁴⁵

Hypodektes: 21²⁸, 148-149, 211³⁷⁸

Iakchos: 146

iconographical representations of sacrifice: 24, 31, 183²³², 242 -246, 271-275, 289-290, 305; *see also* banqueting hero-relief

Ilion, *see also* Troy: 99

immortality,

contrast with mortality and relation to ritual practices: 74, 85-86, 89, 98, 126-127, 171, 206, 220, 222³⁶, 233-235, 238-239, 242, 262, 305, 307, 330-334, 336

and the cult of the war dead: 204, 262, 339

immortal divinities: 74,85, 126-127, 171, 204, 208, 250¹⁶¹, 275, 293, 298, 330-334

Imperial cult: 106³⁷², 123

impurity; *see also* μῑάσμα

heroes considered as impure: 237-238, 241-242, 263-265, 307, 330-332

impure Tritopatores at Selinous: 210²⁷⁷, 220, 221-223, 235-238, 317

worshippers being impure: 229-230, 256, 265, 278, 288-289

impurity and death: 227, 229-230, 237-238, 256, 263-265, 278, 288-289, 307,330-332

incense: 48, 225

incense-burner: 27-28, 31, 45, 48, 137³³; *see also* ἑσχαρά

incubation: 142

infertility: 222³⁴, 317

inventory: 28-29, 31, 39, 57, 202³³¹

invitation of recipient at sacrificial ritual: 67, 101-102, 130, 136-137, 177-178, 191, 194, 266-268, 277-280, 284-286, 293, 304-306, 309, 329; *see also* call-ing, evocation, *θεοξένια*

Iolaos: 205, 238-239; *see also* Ioleos

Ioleos: 133-134, 155, 156, 165, 238-239, 295; *see also* Iolaos

Ion: 133, 143⁷², 163¹⁴⁷, 165, 239

Ioulis, Keos: 202³³¹, 229, 256-257, 263

Iphikles: 93, 96

Iris: 42

Iron Age: 18¹⁶, 315²¹, 336-337, 340; *see also* Geometrie period

Isis: 49

Israelite sacrificial rituals: 249-250; *see also*

Hebrew sacrificial rituals, non-Greek rituals

Isthmia: 59, 80-81, 100³³⁸, 103, 124, 289³⁷⁷, 297, 308¹

Jahve: 46, 112

Jasom 65, 67, 68-69

Jerusalem, temple at: 48, 112, 235⁹⁸, 328⁷⁶

Kalchas: 92, 103, 265

Kallipolis: 61

Kalydon, heroon-. 280³²⁵

Kaphyai, *see* children of Kaphyai

Karneia: 177

Keleos: 147, 334⁸⁷

Keos: 201, 241¹²⁷; *see also* Ioulis

Kephalos: 138⁴⁵, 152¹²³, 158, 163, 166-167

Kerameikos: 30⁴⁰, 77, 84²⁷⁷, 204, 230

Keramos: 196

Kirke: 65, 271

kitchen: 35, 144, 148, 300

Klaros, oracle of Apollon: 61, 73, 265²⁵²

Kleonai: 100, 127⁴⁶⁰

Klytaimnestra: 43, 180²¹⁵

knife: 102, 113, 243-244, 252¹⁷⁵, 275, 288

Knossos: 131⁴, 2 1 9²², 231

Kodros: 133¹³, 239

Kollytos, deme: 139, 148

Konnidas: 92, 100, 103, 122, 334⁸⁷

Kore: 33, 40, 41-42, 44, 64, 66, 68, 70 147

Kos: 31, 123, 137³³, 226-227, 232⁸⁹, 263

sacrificial calendars: 131, 135²³, 139-140, 143, 145, 157, 218-219, 220, 223, 247¹⁴³, 252¹⁷², 308¹, 318³⁵, 319-322

Kourotrophos: 133, 156, 160¹³⁸, 165, 239, 321⁴⁹

Krixos: 95³⁰⁸, 107-108

Kychreus: 261

Kylabras: 178-179

Kyrene: 55¹⁴⁹, 119, 132⁹, 177, 203

sacred law: 131⁵, 263

Kyros: 45, 176, 194, 217¹⁰, 288³⁶⁷

Kyzikos, city: 45, 49¹²⁵

Kyzikos, hero: 64, 69

Laconia: 97

Laertiada: 82, 85, 89, 171, 180, 241

lamentation: 106, 110, 333

Laodike: 200-201; *see also* Hyperborean maidens

Lebadeia: 70, 71, 265; *see also* Trophonios, oracle

leek: 281 ; *see also* onion

Lefkandi: 336⁹²

Lemnos: 111, 114

Lemuria: 108

Leos: 137³², 141

Leto: 194-195, 321⁵⁰

Leukaspis: 144, 156, 163, 260-261

Leukothea: 143, 145, 331

Leuktra, battle at: 97, 261, 270

lexicographers and lexica: 25, 59, 172, 265²⁴⁸, 308-310; *see also* Byzantine literary sources, grammarians, scholia

libation: 13, 16, 42, 60-62, 65, 67-68, 70-71, 75, 80²⁶⁵, 88, 89, 102, 103-104, 112, 119-120, 128, 129, 130, 133, 169, 170¹⁶³, 173, 179²¹³, 182, 188, 194, 197, 198³⁰⁸, 200, 216, 221, 228, 234, 236-237, 242, 250, 256²⁰³, 266-268, 278, 286³⁶⁰, 288, 295, 310, 312, 314, 325; *see also* blood, honey, μέλικρατον, milk, νηφάλιος, oil, water, wine, χοαί

Lindos: 31-33, 37, 58, 238¹¹¹, 320⁴⁷

Linear-B: 39⁸⁹, 336⁹⁶

Linos: 93, 99, 334⁸⁷

Lykos: 149¹⁰⁸

Lykourgos: 196, 331

Machaneus: 219²²

magic: 66, 103³⁵⁰, 109, 285, 306, 316, 333⁸²

Maia: 133, 143⁷², 165, 239

male animal victims: 161, 162, 168

Marathon, battle of: 75-77, 83, 240¹²⁴, 261²²⁴; *see also* war dead

Marathon, hero: 261²²⁴

Marathon, sacrificial calendar from deme: 130, 134, 138, 147, 151-153, 155-157, 159-162, 166-168, 238-239, 281, 288³⁷⁰, 295³⁹⁷, 319

Meals

offerings of meals: 14-15, 16, 32, 102, 129, 137, 181-182, 277, 278, 281, 286, 300, 309, 310, 325; *see also* food, θεοξένια, δαίς, δείπνον

sacrifices in connection with a meal: 39, 179²¹², 276

ritual meals in connection with sacrifices: 15, 35, 36, 47, 58, 123, 137, 140, 148, 149, 180, 185, 195, 197, 216, 287, 295, 298, 313-325; *see also* θύο, θυσία, dining, kitchen, οὐ φορά

offered to the dead 66, 69, 108, 114, 229, 230, 232, 278-280, 286; *see also* dead, περίδειπνον

meat: 14-16, 37, 42, 68, 71, 85, 101-104, 135, 138, 140-146, 154-157, 167, 176, 212, 225, 251, 283, 287-292, 295-299, 309-310, 313-325

boiled: 135²¹, 192, 248¹⁴⁹, 267²⁶⁰

cooked: 15, 16, 130, 137, 230, 232, 248, 277, 281, 283, 319

deposited on table or altar: 130, 137, 138, 140, 142, 192, 217, 227, 281, 283, 309, 319; *see also* τραπεζώματα

destroyed 14, 16, 68, 80²⁶⁵, 101-103, 128, 129, 154, 157, 172, 217, 222-223, 227, 251-254, 256, 257, 285³⁵⁵, 291, 295, 298-299, 316-317, 327, 332, 341; *see also* ἐναγίζω, ἐνάγισμα, ἐναγισμός, ὀλόκαυτος

destroyed by burning 14, 101-102, 155-157, 217-233, 236-237, 256, 277, 309, 316, 341

division of: 37, 140-143, 145-146, 155-157, 220-224, 237, 245, 281, 288, 291-292, 299, 303-304, 323-324

eaten 15, 16, 42, 68, 71, 85, 101-102, 112-113, 130, 136, 140, 143, 146, 153-154, 157, 169, 171, 176, 178, 180-182, 185, 189, 191, 202, 215, 221³¹, 223, 229-231, 238, 245-248, 259, 263, 276, 288-292, 297⁴⁰², 299, 303-304, 309, 311, 313-325; *see also* θύω, θυσία

grilled: 28, 192, 248, 281, 287

nine portions of: 143; *see also* ἐνατεύω not removed from sanctuary, *see* οὐ φορά portions of: 15, 130, 137, 138, 140-143, 146, 192, 217, 218, 220-224, 227, 230, 232, 236-237, 277, 281, 283, 291, 318-320; *see also* γέρα, ἱερῶσυνα, priest, priestess

raw: 130, 137, 140, 141, 230, 232, 281, 287, 309, 313, 319; *see also* τραπεζώματα

sold: 144, 146, 155-156, 292, 313, 318

women and meat; *see* women

meat-hook: 28, 248¹⁴⁹

Medea: 65, 67, 97; *see also* children of Medea

Media: 132⁹

heroes of: 194

medical terminology and literature: 26, 59, 62¹⁷³, 244¹³⁷, 309

Megaloi Theoi: 100³³⁵

Megara, city: 77-78, 82, 123; *see also* war dead

Megara, wife of Herakles: 181; *see also* children of Herakles and Megara

Melanippos: 182-183

Meleager: 196, 205

Melichos: 147, 334⁸⁷

Melissa: 202, 232

Menedeios: 144, 156, 162

Menelaion, Sparta: 18¹⁶, 248¹⁴⁹, 337¹⁰⁰, 339-340

Menelaos: 205, 208, 209, 211³⁸³

Messene: 79, 81, 82, 103

Messenia: 337⁹⁸

Metaponto: 53¹⁴⁰, 231

metics: 141, 291³⁸⁶; *see also* μέτοικοι

Miletos: 220, 247¹⁴³

milk: 61, 65, 67, 70, 75, 102, 109, 254, 278, 325

Miltiades: 97, 199, 208-209, 211

Moirai: 31

"moirocaust": 313, 316-318; *see also* destruction sacrifice, ἐνατεύω

Mopsos: 65

Morgantina: 231-232

Mortality

contrast with immortality and relation to ritual practices: 74, 85-86, 89, 98, 126-127, 171, 220, 233-235, 238-239, 242, 262, 305, 307, 330-334, 336

mortality (*continued*)

mortal side of hero: 21, 74, 85, 89, 98, 126-127, 222³⁶, 225, 233-235, 238-239, 307, 330-334, 339-340; *see also* Achilles, Herakles

murder: 42, 96-97, 107, 126, 227, 251, 264

Muses: 99, 334⁸⁷

music: 13, 197, 199, 204

mutiny: 96³¹³, 264

Mykonos: 237, 253, 259, 321⁵⁰

sacrificial calendar: 220²⁷, 237, 253, 259, 316-317, 319-323, 324

myrrh: 102, 104, 111

Myrtilos: 93, 96, 100³³⁷

mysteries, mystery cult: ἱερόθ¹³⁸, 225, 280³²¹

at Andania: 100³³⁵

at Eleusis: 147⁹⁷, 217⁹

Nauseiros: 165, 334⁸⁷

Neanias: 144,156, 161, 163,166-167, 318³⁵

necromancy: 73²³⁹, 279³¹⁷, 286³⁶⁰

Nekyia- 63, 71, 73, 265, 268²⁰⁷, 271, 275²⁸⁹, 306; *see also* Odysseus

Neleids: 92, 95³⁰⁵

Neleus: 133¹³, 239

Nemea: 100

Neoplatonism: 46-47, 58¹⁵⁶; *see also* philosophy

Neoptolemos: 43-44, 47, 93, 94, 95, 100, 103, 119⁴²⁴, 183²³¹, 265

Nero: 107-108

Nike: 272, 275²⁹⁰

Nike parapet, Athens: 260²²⁰

ninth-part sacrifice: 218, 220-223, 227, 235-237; *see also* ἐνατεύω, meat, destruction sacrifice, animal victim (treat-ment of)

non-Greek rituals described by Greek terminology: 45, 63¹⁷⁹,83, 128,132,176-177, 194, 288³⁶⁷

Nuer, sacrifices among: 327⁷³, 328⁷⁶

Nymphs: 281

oath, sacrifices at oath-taking: 42, 44, 48, 120, 158¹³⁴, 223, 227, 251-253, 259, 271, 305, 325, 327, 329

Odysseus: 62-63, 65, 69, 174-175, 220²⁷, 247, 254, 265, 271, 274-275, 286³⁶⁰, 306; *see also* Nekyia

Oibotas: 93, 97³²⁰

Oidipous: 41, 261-262, 267²⁶⁴; *see also* children of Oidipous

oikist: 178, 263

oikist cult: 18¹⁶, 95,185,186²⁴³,198-199, 203, 206, 209, 211-212, 338-339

oil: 61, 87, 102, 112, 120, 139, 254, 278

Oinoe, deme: 151¹¹⁹

Oinomaos: 96

Oite, mountain: 86, 182²²², 238

olive: 281

olive pit: 231⁸⁶

olive-tree: 133¹³, 200

crowns of olive: 221

Olympia: 48-49, 67, 70, 71, 97³²⁰, 102³⁴⁷, 115, 118, 171, 176¹⁹⁵, 178, 190-192, 197, 252¹⁷², 258²¹⁴, 263, 266, 285

Olympian; *see also* chthonian

divinities: 41, 42, 46-47, 74, 85, 141, 171, 193, 194-195, 215, 269, 298, 310-318, 338, 341 ; *see also* οὐράνιοι θεοί, ἐπουράνιοι θεοί

rituals: 26, 74, 85, 141, 171, 215, 269, 275²⁹⁰, 293, 298, 310-318, 325, 338

Olympian-chthonian model or distinction: 16¹⁴, 17, 46-47, 74, 215, 269, 297⁴⁰², 298, 310-318, 325-326, 328, 330, 338, 341

Onesilos: 198, 208-209, 211

onion: 247, 251; *see also* leek

Onymastos: 263

Opis: 201-202, 298⁴⁰⁵; *see also* Hyper-borean maidens

oracle: 67, 194, 198, 199³¹¹, 211-212, 261

of Ammon: 95, 99, 100, 212³⁸⁵

of Apollon at Argos: 249¹⁵⁶

of Apollon at Delphi: 211

of Apollon at Klaros: 61, 73, 265²⁵²

of Kalchas at Daunian: 103

of Trophonios at Lebadeia: 68, 265

of Zeus at Dodona: 148, 212³⁸⁵

of Zeus at Olympia: 258²¹⁴

Orestes: 111, 222^{3e}, 255, 288³⁰⁸, 289³⁷⁶, 333⁸³

bones of Orestes: 211³⁸⁴

Oresthasion, *see* war dead from Oresthasion

Orpheus: 65, 67, 180²¹⁵, 334⁸⁸

Osiris: 111

outsiders: 154, 316²⁹, 322; *see also* foreigners, ξένοι

oven: 220

Paiania, deme: 133, 240

Palaimom 80-82, 94 100³³⁸, 103, 124-125

Palaimonion, Isthmia: 59, 80-81, 100³³⁸, 297, 308¹

Pamisos: 100

Pan: 198³⁰⁴

Panathenaia: 188²⁵³, 189, 241

Pandora: 64, 65, 158¹³⁴

Pandrosos: 159¹³⁴, 194

Paralos: 142

Parentalia: 108

Paros: 55¹⁵⁰, 199³¹¹

Patras: 100³³⁵, 125⁴⁵⁴

Patroklos: 67, 71, 92, 96, 99³²⁹, 101-102, 228, 254-256, 260²²¹, 267, 335

Pausanias and sacrificial ritual: 71, 76, 78, 91, 94, 96-98, 101, 103, 122, 125-126, 235⁹⁹, 252¹⁷², 297, 306, 307

Pelopidas: 97³²³, 261, 270

Pelopion, Olympia: 70, 190-191

Pelops: 64, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 96, 102³⁴⁷, 117, 118, 171, 176, 178, 190-192, 258²¹⁴, 263, 266, 267, 285, 298⁴⁰⁵, 334⁸⁷

Pergamom 49¹²³, 78, 81, 82, 264

Peripheimos: 261 Perpherees: 200

perquisite of priest or priestess at sacrifice: 140, 142, 146, 219, 319; *see also* γέρρα, meat (portions of), Ιερῶσυνα, priest, priestess

Persephone: 61, 63

Perseus: 205

Persian sacrificial rituals, *see also* non-Greek rituals: 45, 177-178, 179²¹³, 194, 198, 217¹⁰, 288³⁶⁷

Phaiax: 165, 334⁸⁷

Pherrephatte: 147, 334⁸⁷; *see also* Perse-phone, Kore

Phigaleia, *see* Heroes at Phigaleia

Philippos: 197-198

Philoktetes: 19²⁰, 206

Philonis: 138⁴⁵

philosophy and Greek religion: 20²³, 46-47, 193, 195; *see also*

Neoplatonism

Philostratos and sacrificial ritual: 91, 99-102, 104, 105, 122, 126, 297

Phokaiaans killed at Agylla: 82, 83, 88, 97, 170, 171, 198, 239, 329; *see also*

Etruscan sacrificial rituals

Phorbas: 87

Phoroneus: 92, 100³³⁷

Pionis: 93, 95³⁰⁵

Piraeus: 76²⁴⁴, 142, 149¹⁰⁹

pit: 38, 58-60, 62-63, 68-69, 72-73, 80-81, 174, 176, 191, 231, 265, 271, 275, 297, 308¹; *see also* βόθρος, blood cooking pit: 53

placation: 126, 198³⁰³, 239, 241-242, 259, 264, 279³¹⁷, 332-333; *see also* appeasement, expiation, propitiation

plague: 61, 95, 97, 269, 327⁷³; *see also* disease

Plataiai, battle of: 77; *see also* war dead, Heroes at Plataiai

Ploutom 146

Plutarch and sacrificial ritual: 91, 96, 97, 98, 100, 102-103, 104-105, 106, 111, 122, 124, 126, 267, 270-271, 275, 297, 307, 334¹⁰⁰

Poinai: 64, 65

polemarch: 71, 83-84, 170, 241

polis: 193, 321⁵⁰, 322, 340

Polis cave, Ithaka: 18¹⁶, 337¹⁰⁰

pollution: 120, 216, 233, 256, 263-265, 317; *see also* μῖασμα

Polyeidios: 116, 118⁴¹⁹; *see also* children of Polyeidios

Polykrite: 92, 95, 96, 103

Polyneikes: 105

Polyxena: 255, 257²⁰⁵, 265, 274²⁸⁷

Polyxenos: 147, 334⁸⁷

Pompey: 107

Poseidon: 53¹⁴⁰, 55, 80-81, 146, 158¹³⁴, 165, 189, 258, 289³⁷⁷, 314, 322⁵⁴, 334⁸⁷

Helikonios: 35, 37, 40, 44

Temenites: 220²⁷, 322⁵⁴

pottery: 31⁴⁸, 34⁶⁵, 200³²⁰, 229, 230, 232

"powerful actions", *see heilige Handlungen*

Praxithea: 172, 175, 186, 189

pregnant animal victims: 138⁴⁵, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 166, 168, 220²⁷, 325

Preugenes: 93, 100³³⁷

Priamos: 47, 252¹⁷²

Priene: 35, 37, 199³¹¹

priest: 48, 77, 111, 137, 165, 179, 219, 220, 234⁹⁵, 252, 263²³⁶, 269,

priest's share at sacrifice: 112, 134, 140, 142-143, 146, 150, 152, 179, 217, 219¹⁸, 225⁴⁷, 237, 277, 280, 281, 286, 291, 319-320, 323; *see also* γέρρα, ἱερώσυνα, meat (portions of)

priestess: 44, 135²³, 263, 331

priestess' share at sacrifice: 138⁴⁴, 140, 142-143, 146, 147, 152, 157, 318³⁵, 320; *see also* γέρρα, ἱερώσυνα, meat (portions of)

private sacrifices: 72-73, 166, 193, 287, 306, 320

to heroes: 21, 134, 142, 144, 148-149, 196, 284, 286, 304-305, 323; *see also* foundations of private cults

Probalinthos, deme: 151¹¹⁹

procession: 13, 33-34, 45, 76, 95, 100³³⁵, 102, 119, 145, 183, 210, 229, 263²³⁶; *see also* πομπή

Procharisteria: 33

prohibition and sacrifice: 37⁸⁰, 180, 221, 249-250, 319-324; *see also* women, foreigners, outsiders, ξένοι

prohibition on the removal of meat: 143, 218-219, 225, 311, 313-325; *see also* οὐ φορά Prokris: 138⁴⁵, 158¹³⁴

Prometheus: 314²⁰

propitiation: 64, 72, 83, 97, 189²⁵⁹, 194, 197-198, 242, 251, 306; *see also* appeasement, expiation, placation

Proschaireteria: 33

Ptoios: 149¹⁰⁸

purification: 60-61, 87, 96, 106, 114, 121, 127-128, 154¹²⁸, 222, 227, 229, 233, 244, 251, 253, 256, 257, 259, 263-265, 289-290, 295, 305, 325, 327⁷³, 329, 333⁸²; *see also* impurity

Pylon, *see* Heroïnes at Pylon

Pylouchos: 138⁴⁵

pyre; *see also* πυρά

used at sacrifices: 61, 65, 68, 102, 173, 238

funeral pyre: 102, 181²²¹, 228⁶⁵, 230-233, 255, 290³⁷⁸

pyre of Herakles on Mount Oite: 86, 238, 290³⁷⁸

Pyrgilion, *see* Hero at Pyrgilion

Pyrrhos: 92, 95³⁰⁸, 105, 174¹⁸⁶

son of Pynhos: 95³⁰⁸, 105

Pythagoras: 206, 334⁸⁸

Pythaistai: 47, 324

Pythia: 83, 96, 170, 212

relies: 337¹⁰⁰

revitalization: 266, 268, 286³⁰⁰, 306, 332

Rhamnous: 76²⁴⁴, 149¹⁰⁸, 167¹⁵⁷

Rhodes: 31-33, 37, 79, 210, 211, 323

river: 62, 65, 187, 194²⁸⁷, 217⁹

worshipped with sacrifices: 20, 100³³⁵, 251, 253, 257, 259, 305

Roman "hero-cults": 90-91, 106-109

sacrifices and rituals: 90, 95, 108-109, 145⁹³, 174¹⁸⁶, 232⁸⁹, 276²⁹³

Roman sources of Greek religion: 16, 21²⁸, 22³⁰, 25, 45, 58-59, 60¹⁶⁶, 61, 72-73, 80-82, 90-91, 98, 119, 122-128, 234, 278, 297, 303, 306-310, 316

ruler cult: 18¹⁷, 123

sacred law: 19, 131, 138⁴⁴, 140, 142, 150, 157, 192, 203³³⁸, 210³⁷⁷, 219-221, 227, 263, 277, 279³¹⁷, 308¹, 316, 321⁴⁹, 332⁸¹, 339¹¹³; *see also* Selinous, Kyrene

Sacred War: 95, 96

sacrificial calendars: 16, 19, 131, 147, 150-169, 192, 222³⁷, 284, 288, 292³⁹³, 304, 329; *see also* Eleusis, Erchia, Kos, Marathon, Mykonos, Salaminioi, Teithras, Thorikos

Salaminioi, sacrificial calendar of the *genos* : 130, 133-134, 141, 142-143, 147, 148, 151-153, 155-156, 163-168, 237-239, 295, 313, 318³⁵

Salamis: 75, 198, 258²⁰⁸, 261; *see also* heroes of Salamis

Samos: 48-49, 55¹⁴⁹, 257²⁰⁴, 261²²²

Sappho: 206

Sarapis: 37, 100³³⁵, 319⁴¹, 320⁴⁷

sausage: 247-248; *see also* αἱμάτιον

scapegoat: 228⁶³; *see also* φαρμακός

Schoinos, *see* Heroines at Schoinos

scholia: 25, 50-54, 59, 71-72, 114-120, 126, 174¹⁸⁶, 183²³², 191²⁷⁰, 248¹⁴⁶, 256, 265²⁴⁸, 269-271, 296⁴⁰¹, 297, 308-310; *see also* Byzantine literary sources, grammarians, lexicographers

sea: 194²⁸⁷

worshipped with sacrifices: 251, 253, 257, 305

sacrifices performed into the sea: 47, 112, 217⁹

sea-shells: 38⁸³, 231

Segesta: 197-198

Selinous: 53¹⁴⁰, 217

sacred law: 131, 157, 210³⁷⁷, 219-223, 227, 235-238, 250¹⁶¹ 264²⁴⁴, 266, 275, 277, 279³¹⁷, 285³⁵⁷, 288³⁷⁰, 316-317, 319⁴¹, 321⁴⁹, 323, 332⁸¹

Semele: 139, 141-142, 143, 144, 156, 157, 220²⁷, 237, 298⁴⁰⁵, 316-317, 324, 334⁸⁷

Sicily: 60¹⁶⁶, 96, 124, 132⁹, 197, 288, 339¹¹³

Sikyon: 101, 103, 127⁴⁶⁰, 182-183, 203, 209, 211

situation or occasion decisive of choice of ritual: 16, 20, 63, 67-70, 74, 83, 85, 187, 216, 224, 226-227, 235, 239, 242, 251-254, 257, 259, 261, 268, 291, 305, 307, 317, 320-321, 325-330, 341; *see also* crisis, character of recipient

Skambonidai, deme: 141

Skedastos: 93, 97, 258²⁰⁸, 261, 270; *see also* daughters of Skedastos

Skira: 189

Skiros: 166, 289⁴⁰⁵, 334(87)

slaves, access to sacrifices: 189²⁵⁷, 291 smoke: 42, 47, 95³⁰⁵, 127, 154, 181, 194, 282, 287; *see also* κνίση

Smyrna: 35, 106, 179²⁰⁹, 224

Solon: 261

laws of Solon regulating funerary practices: 104, 228-229; *see also* funerary laws

Sophokles, worshipped as hero: 145⁸⁸

Sostratos: 93

soûls of the dead: 62-63, 65, 66, 268²⁶⁶, 278-279; *see also* ghosts

Sounion, *see* Herakleion at Porthmos

Sparta: 97

Spartan kings' religious status after death: 206, 208, 209

statue: 34, 81²⁶⁸, 96-97, 200³¹⁶, 204, 209, 281

of hero: 19, 31, 137³³, 149, 167¹⁵⁷, 170¹⁶³

sterility: 222³⁴, 227⁶²

Strategos: 137³²

suicide: 70, 88, 94, 95, 97, 107-108, 118, 126, 238, 240¹²⁴, 249¹⁵⁶, 258

sword 109

used at sacrifices: 62-63, 96³¹⁰, 102, 260²²¹, 272-273, 275

synoecism: 320-321

Syracuse: 47, 163, 260

Syria, heroes of: 176

table: 14, 16, 31, 38, 47, 102, 130, 137-140, 142, 145⁸⁸, 169, 178, 191-192, 217, 219, 221-222, 223³⁹, 227, 237, 244-246, 277-278, 281, 282-283, 286, 288³⁰⁸, 304, 319, 320⁴³, 341; *see also* θεοξένια, τράπεζα, meat

Talthybios: 93, 97

Tantalos: 178²⁰⁶

Taras: 85, 89, 171, 180, 241

Teiresias: 41, 62-63, 174-175, 265-267, 271, 285-286

Teithras, sacrificial calendar from deme: 151

Telephos: 263-264

Telesidromos: 146

Tenos: 53¹⁴⁰

Teukros: 165, 334⁸⁷

Thasos: 21²⁸, 55, 86, 127^{46°}, 135-136, 143, 148, 172, 219, 221, 226⁵⁴, 237, 247¹⁴³, 258, 261²²³, 262, 266, 284-285, 297, 299-300, 305, 315²²

Thea: 147

Thebes: 181-182, 203, 205, 206, 261

monument of Seven against Thebes in Argos: 59, 339¹¹³

Themis: 147, 334⁸⁷

Themistokles: 116, 118, 249¹⁵⁶, 260²²¹

Theogenes: 21²⁸

heos: 147

Theoxenia at Delphi: 277, 285

Thera: 95³⁰⁵, 230, 232⁸⁹, 279³¹⁷, 323

Theras: 92, 95³⁰⁵

Thersander: 93, 96³¹⁰

Theseia: 100, 103, 144

Theseus: 42, 100, 103, 152¹²², 165, 334⁸⁷

Thesmophoria: 61¹⁷⁰, 217⁹, 325

tholos tomb; *see also* tomb

at Berbati, Argolid: 337⁹⁸

at Menidi, Attica: 337⁹⁸

Thorikos, deme: 218-219, 226

sacrificial calendar from deme: 30, 130, 131, 134, 138, 144, 147, 151-153, 155-159, 161-162, 166-168, 218-219, 234⁹⁵, 284³⁵⁰, 313, 318³⁵, 319

Thorikos, hero: 138⁴⁵

Threptos: 147, 334⁸⁷

Timesios: 203, 208-209, 211

Titane: 66, 67, 70, 100, 308¹

Tlapolemos: 208, 210, 211

tomb, *see also* burial, grave, τᾶφος, gravestone

of god: 111

of hero: 14, 20, 77-79, 82, 86, 91, 94-97, 99-102, 118, 127⁴⁶⁰, 176, 178, 184-185, 187-188, 190-191, 197, 200-203, 236, 255, 261²²⁸, 263, 265, 270, 300, 305, 333, 335-339

of the ordinary dead: 21, 69, 86-89, 104-105, 108, 128, 136, 228, 230-233, 257, 263, 278, 280, 331, 335-339

Late Bronze Age tombs: 18¹⁶, 200³²⁰, 201³²², 336-339
 torches: 33, 65, 68, 70
 torch-race: 76
Totenmahl relief; *see* banqueting hero-relief
 tragedy as source of sacrificial rituals: 19, 44, 193²⁷⁸, 200, 254-256, 267
 Trajan: 95
 Trikorynthos, deme: 151¹¹⁹
 tripod: 18¹⁶, 42, 44, 192²⁷⁵
 Triptolemos: 146, 147
 Tritopatores: 156, 159¹³⁷, 210³⁷⁷, 217, 219-223, 225, 227, 235-238, 263-264, 277, 288, 317, 336⁹⁶
 Tronis, cult of the Heros Archegetes at: 236¹⁰⁴, 259²¹⁷, 323⁵⁸
 Trophonios: 67, 68, 70, 71, 265
 Troy: 94, 96, 179²¹³
 Heroes fallen at Troy: 255; *see also* Achilles
 Twelve Gods: 34⁶⁵, 320⁴⁷
 Tydeidai: 82, 85, 89, 171, 180, 241
 Tydeus: 196, 205
 Tyliossos: 131⁴, 219²²
 Tynabos: 149
 Tynaros: 149¹⁰⁹
 Tyre: 86
 unburnt sacrifices: 32
 underworld: 73, 113, 229, 257, 265-268, 306, 308
 divinities of the underworld: 14, 16, 17, 61, 64, 65-67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 106, 110, 114, 127, 148¹⁰⁶, 237, 265-268, 285, 286, 338; *see also* chthonian divinities
 vegetables: 13, 15, 16, 179, 196, 256²⁰³, 277, 278, 281, 284, 309
 Vestal Virgins: 107-108
 violent death; *see also* βίαιοθάνατος
 and hero-cults: 82, 83, 88, 91, 96-98, 101, 107, 118, 126, 239, 241, 332-333
 and other ritual activity: 222, 235, 257, 264, 333⁸²

virgiri: 261

votives: 37, 199, 340¹¹⁸

war

and sacrifices: 111, 172-174, 186-189, 224⁴⁵, 227, 239, 252-253, 258-259, 260, 266, 268, 271-275, 290, 305, 317, 327, 329; *see also* battle-line sacrifices, σφάγια

and hero-cult: 96-98, 107-108, 123-126, 170, 203, 206, 239, 240, 241, 257-262, 264, 266, 268, 305, 329, 338-339; *see also* war dead

war dead: 22, 92, 93, 98, 107, 108, 206, 257-262, 264, 338-339

at Marathon: 75-77, 81, 82, 124, 240

from Megara: 77-78, 81, 82, 123-124

from Oresthasion 93, 96

at Plataiai: 77-78, 92, 94, 95, 96, 102, 103, 118, 122, 124-126, 179, 202, 204, 205³⁵³, 262²²⁹, 267, 275²⁸⁹

in Persian wars: 66¹⁸⁶, 77

on Thasos; *see also* Agathoi: 135-136, 148, 172, 258, 262, 266, 299-300

sacrifices to the war dead: 76-78, 82, 84-85, 95, 96, 102, 103, 107, 118, 122-126, 135, 148, 170, 172, 179, 197, 202, 203, 241, 258, 262, 267, 275²⁸⁹, 299-300, 339

religious status of the war dead: 76, 84, 204, 206, 262, 264, 338-339; *see also* immortality

water: 26¹⁸, 47, 55¹⁵⁰, 62, 63, 67, 70, 87, 97, 102, 120, 145⁸⁸, 173, 182, 186-188, 233, 248, 251, 253, 254, 256, 278, 314, 325

wheat: 139-140, 145, 220; *see also* grain

white animal victim, *see* colour

White goddesses: 111, 222³⁶

winds: 60, 64, 66, 67, 70, 174¹⁸⁴, 198³⁰⁴, 225, 241, 251, 253, 257, 259, 305

wine: 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 70, 75, 102, 109, 112, 129, 139, 145, 173, 178, 179²⁰⁹, 182, 186-188, 191, 220, 221, 236-237, 245¹³⁹, 247, 254, 266, 278, 285, 314, 325

wineless sacrifice: 42-43, 130³, 133, 155, 157, 188, 237, 240, 314, 317; *see also* νηφάλιος, χοαὶ ἄοινοι

women: 96, 104, 111, 201, 218, 228⁶⁷, 229⁷⁴, 256

given meat at sacrifices: 141-142, 157, 291³⁸⁶, 324

not allowed to taste the meat: 85, 171, 180
 prohibited to participate in cult: 180²¹⁵, 221²⁹, 323
 wood: 26, 29, 65, 69, 79, 163¹⁴⁷, 165¹⁵¹, 166, 173, 187, 188, 218¹², 220
 wreath: 31, 33, 75, 77, 102, 104, 111, 137³³, 194-195, 234; *see also* garland
 Xanthos: 92, 96, 116, 117⁴¹³
 Xouthos: 150
 Zetos: 206; *see also* Amphionēs
 Zeus: 40, 41-42, 48-49, 115, 117, 147, 148, 156, 176, 190-192, 198³⁰⁴,
 217-219, 223-225, 236, 238, 251, 258²¹⁴, 263, 277, 314, 331, 334⁸⁷
 Apotropaïos: 320⁴⁷, 323
 Astrapaïos: 46, 47
 Basileus: 194
 Chthonios: 316²⁹, 321⁵⁰, 322
 Epakrios: 156
 Epopetes: 156, 224, 225, 240-241
 Eumenes: 222-223
 Herkeios: 46, 47, 52, 138⁴⁵, 147, 334⁸⁷
 hoïios: 156
 Hypatos: 160¹³⁸, 194
 Kataibates: 152¹²², 156
 Machaneus: 218, 225, 227
 Meilichios: 147⁹⁹, 219, 222-224, 225, 226-227, 316, 319⁴¹, 321⁴⁹, 323,
 329, 332⁸¹
 Milichios: 156
 Ourios: 322
 Philios: 282
 Polieus: 156, 218, 225, 226-227, 234⁹⁵, 320⁴⁷, 322
 Soter: 100
 Tropaios: 139⁴⁸